

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 24, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy peace lies deeper than the noise and confusion of the world's dread alarm. Thy peace is as a tide, too deep for sound and foam. We know that the world's peace waits upon the peace of God in the hearts of men. We come before Thee to open our hearts, that our minds and hearts may be kept in perfect peace by Thy grace, that we may know that which passeth knowledge of the peace of God in our hearts. Grant, we pray, that with calmness of thought and with a devotion to the highest interests of mankind we can quietly and consistently with Thy will perform the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

EDWIN C. BURLEIGH, a Senator from the State of Maine, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 613).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of documents and files of papers in the Department of Commerce which are not needed or are useful in the transaction of current business and which have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 97).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases referred to the court by resolution of the Senate under the act of March 3, 1887, known as the Tucker Act, which cases were dismissed by the court on the motion of the claimants' attorneys, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.;

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Two Buttes, Colo., praying for the formation of a United States of the world, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Florida praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Texas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lyon, Allen, Sedgwick, Reno, Coffee, Sumner, and Dewey Counties, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fairview, Salina, Pretty Prairie, and Altoona, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring revenue stamps to be placed on individual bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the faculty and students of Fairmount College and Church, Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. I send to the desk a short communication from the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners requesting action looking to an investigation of the causes of the advanced price of gasoline. I ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF DYERS AND CLEANERS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 18, 1916.

HON. GEORGE T. OLIVER.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners held in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a few days ago, a resolution was passed favoring an investigation by the Government of the rapid and continuous increase in the price of "gasoline" by the refiners. Our industry uses millions of gallons of this article and we believe the present advance of practically 100 per cent is uncalled for. I, as secretary of the association, was instructed to bring this matter to your notice.

Thanking you in advance for any trouble we may cause you,

I remain,

THOMAS W. MURPHY.

Secretary Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Apollo, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to place a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Delaware County Children's Aid Society, of Swarthmore, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Alderson, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 179, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, of Williamsport, Pa., remonstrating against a tax on admission charges to theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Pitman Manufacturing Co., of Laconia, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the Aspinook Co.; the Ashland Cotton Co., of Jewett City; the Diamond Spring Line Co., of Stafford Springs; the Glazier Manufacturing Co., of South Glastonbury; the Pond Lily Co., of New Haven; the Pratt, Read & Co. and the Pratt, Read Player Action Co., of Deep River, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented the memorial of Thomas Gannett Holyoke, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the construction of a building for the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Paris Gibson, of Great Falls, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge homesteads and for the leasing of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Little Rock, Ark., and a petition of the Cotton Exchange, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate future deliveries of cotton, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PITTMAN presented a petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of Nevada, praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Peninsular Paper Co., of Ypsilanti, Mich., and a petition of the Michigan Bag & Paper Co., of Jackson, Mich., praying for the imposition of a

duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lega Cittadina di Mutuo Soccorso, No. 1, of Laurium, Mich., and a petition of the Italo-American Federation, of Upper Peninsula, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Woodbine, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Stars and Stripes Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Burlington, Iowa, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of West Virginia, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Vermont, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for patented and trademarked articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Windsor Locks, Conn., praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven, of the Consumers' League, and of the Motherhood Club, of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1793) granting to the State of Kansas title to certain lands in said State for use as a game preserve, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 62) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 888) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to confer upon Marcus A. Jordan the life-saving medal of the first class, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 63) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 64) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3761) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3762) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral locations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3763) granting an increase of pension to Jane McD. Johnston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3764) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Florida National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3765) granting an increase of pension to George Engleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CULBERSON):

A bill (S. 3766) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3767) requiring all public-building bills to be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for investigation and report as to whether proposed buildings and sites are needed and the expenditure justified and as to the lowest cost at which buildings found necessary may be erected with economy and efficiency; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3768) granting lands to Wade Pemberton and others, of Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3769) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 3770) to amend the act to regulate commerce, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3772) for the relief of the estate of Facundo Gonzales (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3773) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallocate the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3774) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses Agreement of July 7, 1883; and

A bill (S. 3775) to establish the Mount Baker National Park, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3776) providing for the establishment of a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3777) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3778) granting a pension to Preston S. Atchison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 3780) granting an increase of pension to Canrina R. H. Richey;

A bill (S. 3781) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Schreiber;

A bill (S. 3782) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Sloggy;

A bill (S. 3783) granting an increase of pension to Theodore D. Swain;

A bill (S. 3784) granting an increase of pension to George M. Titus;

A bill (S. 3785) granting an increase of pension to John M. Turner;

A bill (S. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Welliver;

A bill (S. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Hulda L. Winter;

A bill (S. 3788) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals;

A bill (S. 3789) granting a pension to Lucina C. Hatch;

A bill (S. 3790) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Harris;

A bill (S. 3791) granting a pension to James B. Gillick;

A bill (S. 3792) granting a pension to Charles H. Eyerma;

A bill (S. 3793) granting a pension to Willie J. Etheridge;

A bill (S. 3794) granting a pension to Fannie S. Douglass;

A bill (S. 3795) granting a pension to William S. Davidson;

A bill (S. 3796) granting a pension to Effie M. Crall;

A bill (S. 3797) granting a pension to Mabel F. Coen;

A bill (S. 3798) granting a pension to Catherine N. Burlingame;

A bill (S. 3799) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter;

A bill (S. 3800) granting a pension to William W. Batterton;

A bill (S. 3801) granting a pension to Charles A. Barthrop;

A bill (S. 3802) granting a pension to Edwin Ash;

A bill (S. 3803) granting a pension to Leander Alexander;

A bill (S. 3804) granting a pension to Lottie Short;

A bill (S. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Clemons;

A bill (S. 3806) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Cantrell;

A bill (S. 3807) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boring;

A bill (S. 3808) granting an increase of pension to Caroline L. Ackley;

A bill (S. 3809) granting a pension to Matilda Weger;

A bill (S. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Pedro B. de G. Fernandez;

A bill (S. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Goodwin;

A bill (S. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harpham;

A bill (S. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Morey;

A bill (S. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge Morse;

A bill (S. 3815) granting an increase of pension to William Mower;

A bill (S. 3816) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Phillips;

A bill (S. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Emiles Pomeroy;

A bill (S. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Pryor;

A bill (S. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Randall;

A bill (S. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Rice;

A bill (S. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Rice;

A bill (S. 3822) granting a pension to Ottiwell M. Roberts;

A bill (S. 3823) granting a pension to Albert F. Pray;

A bill (S. 3824) granting a pension to Elisha Painter;

A bill (S. 3825) granting a pension to Sarah E. Muzy;

A bill (S. 3826) granting a pension to Penelope S. Miller;

A bill (S. 3827) granting a pension to Michael Maloney;

A bill (S. 3828) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;

A bill (S. 3829) granting a pension to Ella S. Kyes;

A bill (S. 3830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGooden;

A bill (S. 3831) granting an increase of pension to Mercy A. Martin;

A bill (S. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Hunt;

A bill (S. 3833) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;

A bill (S. 3834) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Jones;

A bill (S. 3835) granting an increase of pension to John Little;

A bill (S. 3836) granting a pension to Delia E. Wall;

A bill (S. 3837) granting a pension to Isaac N. Troutman;

A bill (S. 3838) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;

A bill (S. 3839) granting a pension to Mary Standifer;

A bill (S. 3840) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith;

A bill (S. 3841) granting a pension to Dollie E. A. Smith;

A bill (S. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Marion D. Egbert;

A bill (S. 3843) granting an increase of pension to William R. Donaldson;

A bill (S. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Dean; and

A bill (S. 3845) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3846) granting a pension to Mary E. Lindsay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3847) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Runkle (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3848) granting an increase of pension to John Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3849) granting an increase of pension to William Painter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3850) granting an increase of pension to William P. McCartney;

A bill (S. 3851) granting an increase of pension to Archibald Haddan;

A bill (S. 3852) granting an increase of pension to John Stauffer;

A bill (S. 3853) granting a pension to Caroline Chambers;

A bill (S. 3854) granting an increase of pension to William Wright;

A bill (S. 3855) granting an increase of pension to David J. Braughler;

A bill (S. 3856) granting a pension to Mary M. Lose;

A bill (S. 3857) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Aul; and

A bill (S. 3858) granting a pension to Amelia Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 3859) granting an increase of pension to Teodora Antonia Baca de Martinez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 3860) for the relief of the Chettimanchi Band or Tribe of Indians of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3861) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the withdrawal from bond tax free of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses when mixed with suitable denaturing materials,'" approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3862) for the relief of the Rapides Building & Loan Association, of Alexandria, La.;

A bill (S. 3863) for the relief of the Shreveport Mutual Building Association;

A bill (S. 3864) for the relief of the Sixth District Building & Loan Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3865) for the relief of the Fidelity Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3866) for the relief of the Union Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3867) for the relief of the Iberia Building Association, of New Iberia, La.; and

A bill (S. 3868) for the relief of the Teutonia Loan & Building Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3869) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3870) to validate the Indian allotment application of Anna Campbell Valentine; and

A bill (S. 3871) to validate the homestead application of Edith A. Purdy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3872) for the relief of John Horgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3873) to authorize the counties of Minidoka and Cassia, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3874) granting an increase of pension to Peleg N. Carson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3875) granting a pension to Ione I. Bell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3876) for the relief of George H. Rarey; and

A bill (S. 3877) for the relief of William Fulton Hedges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3878) granting a pension to Michael Smyth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3879) granting an increase of pension to Milton M. Jones (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3880) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Keffer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Mandana C. Thorp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3882) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3883) granting a pension to Annie Bonville (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3884) granting a pension to John Washburn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Fitch Lockwood;

A bill (S. 3886) granting an increase of pension to Lucy R. Hall;

A bill (S. 3887) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah W. Cross;

A bill (S. 3888) granting a pension to Elias Lyon;

A bill (S. 3889) granting an increase of pension to Lula S. Knight Bigelow; and

A bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Robert Whitehead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 3891) granting a pension to G. W. Leathers;

A bill (S. 3892) granting an increase of pension to Harry Colpus; and

A bill (S. 3893) granting a pension to Robert M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3894) for the relief of Henry E. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3895) for the relief of the Portland Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3896) granting an increase of pension to Hettie Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3897) to authorize the purchase of the manuscript of the Legislative History of the Army of the United States and to make appropriation therefor (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3898) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Stiles, alias Charles White; and

A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to Josef Messany; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3900) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3901) for the relief of Lieuts. E. E. Bennett, W. N. Porter, and W. W. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3902) granting a pension to James T. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 3903) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 3904) conferring upon tribes or bands of Indians the right of nomination and election of their agents or superintendents, to encourage them to interest themselves in their own affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hanson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3906) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Harbinson; and

A bill (S. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3908) granting a pension to Jennie Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3909) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Dawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request):

A bill (S. 3910) for the relief of Capt. Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to S. 381, the so-called Philippine government bill, and ask that it may be printed and also printed in the RECORD. I will say, if permitted to do so, that I offer it as a substitute for all the amendments I have heretofore offered on this subject. I have revised it somewhat and amplified it slightly. I think it now presents the views of those who think something should be done in the matter at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator have any objection to having it read at this time?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Not the slightest. I shall be very glad to include in my request that it shall be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment was read and ordered to be printed, as follows:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter

prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately upon the passage of the act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MUNITIONS OF WAR.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. —) to provide a tax on munitions of war manufactured in the United States and to amend the act of Congress approved October 22, 1914, entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1107) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to public printing and binding and distribution of Government publications, which was referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,250 for rental of additional quarters in the District of Columbia for the Navy Department during the remainder of the fiscal year 1916, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continuous spread of the white pine blister, rust, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment proposing to set aside from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as

the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to be expended in the employment of competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION."

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate all facts bearing on the present condition of the frigate *Constitution*, now lying in the Charles River, Boston, and also an estimate of the amount of money that will be required to put the frigate in a condition of good repair, with a view of retaining the vessel as a historic relic of the early days of the American Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional assistant clerk at \$1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals be authorized to employ a stenographer temporarily and that the said stenographer be paid at the rate of \$50 per month for each day of such employment, not exceeding four months, and that such services be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TROPICS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a pamphlet entitled "Self-Government in the Tropics," by Samuel L. Parrish, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to the printing of it as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 250).

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that there be printed as a document certain extracts from reports of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in the Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses, favorably recommending the passage of resolutions for the submission of the question of national constitutional prohibition to the several States of the Union, together with a letter from ex-Senator Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, to Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, United States Senator from Texas, relating thereto. I have had an estimate made and find that it will cost about \$50.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that 2,000 additional copies of the document be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9416. An act making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LANDS IN NEVADA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have asked that the bill go over this morning.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the bill has been at the head of the calendar for a month. It is a simple measure. I submit that it is not fair for the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to constantly object to its consideration. The bill has been attacked through the newspapers of this town, and that attack

is having its effect. Nearly every western Senator has been attacked on account of the bill, and bills similar to it. I do not think it fair to western Senators to permit this attack to go on as it has done, and not to be answered at this time. So I ask the Senator from Utah, for that reason, to allow the bill to be taken up at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have previously stated to the Senator from Nevada that the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak on the bill, and that Senator is now absent from the Chamber. I therefore ask that the bill go over until the Senator from New Mexico shall be present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Do I understand the Senator from New Mexico to whom the Senator from Utah refers to be Senator FALL?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. And that that Senator is now sick?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not the Senator is sick, but he is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, after the bill has been on the calendar for a month, and we have tried to get it considered and disposed of, after it has been a dozen times passed over at the request of the Senator from Utah, it seems to me that the Senator from New Mexico has had sufficient opportunity to be present and to discuss the bill if he desires to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Nevada that I should object to the consideration of the bill, and I have done so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the bill goes over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1062) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 706) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 609) to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va., was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 611) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the right of suffrage was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of Beverly E. Whitehead was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide for holding the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition in 1918 was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 2406) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just announced on the calendar, which is a pension bill, notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move as a substitute for that motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration—

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question first comes on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. My point of order is that a motion of this kind is not in order until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, and before the calendar has been thoroughly called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled. It is a rule of the Senate that at the conclusion of morning business, or if morning business has not been concluded by the hour of 1 o'clock, a motion may be made to take up any bill on the calendar; and, once having been made, a motion to substitute some other bill is not in order. The motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill must first be passed on. The question now, therefore, is—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order that I may understand what the ruling of the Chair is, I desire to ask, does the Chair rule that before 1 o'clock, if morning business is closed, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar can be made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does so rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no doubt about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was forced to that conclusion by the Senator from Utah at the last session of Congress on a former ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, whether the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3518. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the title of the bill be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent, but is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness, as is also the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They are both paired.

Mr. COLT. In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I have ascertained that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, is absent. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If he were present and at liberty to vote, my colleague would vote "yea." I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY], who is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. BURLEIGH. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I will therefore take the liberty of voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Lippitt	Shafroth
Borah	Gronna	Lodge	Shields
Brandeggee	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Catron	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Norris	Stone
Chilton	James	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Curtis	Kern	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	La Follette	Polindexter	Walsh
du Pont	Lane	Pomerene	Weeks
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Works

NAYS—12.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Robinson	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Husting	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman

NOT VOTING—28.

Beckham	Gore	Overman	Simmons
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Lewis	Ransdell	Swanson
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Tillman
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Warren
Goff	Newlands	Shively	Williams

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors. It proposes to place upon the pension roll, at the rate per month therein specified, the following-named persons:

George Jagers, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Barnet Hauver, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Phillips, alias Charles Gray, late of U. S. S. *Key West*, *Great Western*, and *Naumkeag*, United States Navy, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John R. Thompson, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Schnetzer, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Goldsborough, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma F. Webster, widow of George A. Webster, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John A. Morris, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Spencer J. Dyer, late of Company B, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and second lieutenant Company K, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane E. Bloss, widow of George E. Bloss, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of George E. Bloss until she reaches the age of 16 years.

Cyrus Spooner, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Dellias W. Compton, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catherine Scheibel, widow of William Scheibel, late of Company M, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charlotte J. Smith, widow of Frederick L. Smith, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lydia A. Smith, widow of Augustus E. Smith, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Daniel L. Tallcott, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aurelia M. Todd, widow of Samuel D. Todd, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emma M. Bowman, widow of Edward Bowman, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susie S. Flanders, widow of George J. Flanders, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Josiah P. Hackett, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew Jewell, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William J. Young, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rebecca Hutton, widow of Michael Hutton, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Peter M. Miller, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas A. Carpenter, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Bresnahan, widow of John Bresnahan, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Josiah A. Dadmun, late musician, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Irving W. Coombs, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Hodgkins, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theophile A. Dauphin, late of Company K, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Wooley, alias John Wilson, late of Company F, Third Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Steel, late of Company D, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Ickley, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Caroline E. Beck, widow of George A. Beck, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Nicholas A. Bovee, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Matilda J. Hampton, widow of John Hampton, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Harvey E. Derrin, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company L, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alberton H. Town, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ruby L. Knapp, helpless and dependent child of William B. Knapp, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, \$12 per month.

Terance McGrath, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Lockwood*, and *Hetzel*, United States Navy, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bridget Prickett, widow of Milton Prickett, late of Company A, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

William Shaw, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Horace H. Lockwood, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and First Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$21 per month.

George W. Sargent, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary B. Yerington, former widow of Almon Yerington, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Matilda Davis, widow of William H. Davis, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry Wagoner, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rufus S. Maxwell, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Herbert M. Starbird, late of Company M, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Abbie F. Dyer, widow of Ambrose S. Dyer, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry J. McFadden, late second lieutenant Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harris B. Hubbell, late of Company D, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orin W. Goodale, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eliza M. Watkins, widow of Joseph H. Watkins, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Essie Watkins, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph H. Watkins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Eliza M. Watkins the name of the said Essie Watkins shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Eliza M. Watkins.

William Howard, late of Company B, One hundred and second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac H. Bodenhamer, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aliza A. Gordon, widow of Eli P. Gordon, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Americus V. Larrance, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harriet A. Turnbull, widow of John M. Turnbull, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Samuel R. Edwards, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month.

Emma D. Phelps, widow of George W. Phelps, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Franklin H. Gillett, late of Company A, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Halsey, late of Company D, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lavina Hunter, widow of William F. Hunter, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Abraham Jones, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Kenyon, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ebenezer C. Lafollett, late of Company F, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catharine Mayer, widow of Nikolas Mayer, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clara Mayer, helpless and dependent child of said Nikolas Mayer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Mayer the name of the said Clara Mayer shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Mayer.

George Ringle, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alfred P. Williams, late of Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George E. Fleming, late of Company D, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susan M. Lysinger, widow of Joseph H. Lysinger, late of United States Navy, \$12 per month.

George W. Aldrich, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

August Baker, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Dunham, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William C. Fickas, late of Company L, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hacker Davis, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amelia Hubbard, widow of Lucius F. Hubbard, late colonel Fifth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Wilson, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William R. Morrell, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard H. McWhorter, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry; \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Hill, late of the U. S. ram *Queen of the West*, United States Navy, \$21.50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Bond, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Adams, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maria E. Bowers, widow of Ira M. Bowers, late second lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charles P. De Forest, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry H. Geer, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret Semple, widow of James W. Semple, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry H. Klock, late first lieutenant and adjutant Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

May Bell Anderson, widow of Thomas J. Anderson, late first lieutenant and aide-de-camp Gen. Lane's staff, United States Volunteers, and major and assistant adjutant general, United States Volunteers, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eugene B. Fisher, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Ames, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Forty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry J. Mullins, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hannah R. Linton, widow of James D. Linton, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Benjamin Linton, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. Hanes, widow of John Hanes, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Joseph H. Hanes, helpless and dependent child of said John Hanes, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. Hanes the name of the said Joseph H. Hanes shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah E. Hanes.

Nancy C. Fouts, widow of William P. Fouts, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Norman J. Painter, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, \$12 per month.

Mary Norton, helpless and dependent child of Patrick Norton, late of Company A, Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Napoleon Tulip, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ann L. Elliott, former widow of Jesse Elliott, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Martha C. Igo, widow of Daniel Igo, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company I, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jesse Thompson, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bella Curry, widow of Amos P. Curry, late captain Company B, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susan Robinson, widow of Squire Robinson, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and

former widow of Robert G. Bloomfield, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Caroline J. Cromwell, widow of Charles W. Cromwell, late first lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Rangers, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Gideon Mason, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and twenty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gabriel Anderson, alias Gabriel Oleson, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Lappier, late of Company D, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel M. Terry, late of Troops D and K, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa Galtner, widow of George Galtner, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John Wiebel, late of Company F, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elander R. Grant, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Wentworth, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Albatross*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward A. Savage, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William O. Freeman, late of U. S. S. *Sabine*, *Ohio*, and *Casco*, United States Navy, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Zadoc McFarland, alias Samuel G. West, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert R. Ferris, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. Davis, widow of Benjamin F. Davis, late of Companies I and A, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

John Kemmer, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary C. Estes, widow of Albert H. Estes, late captain Company E, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Osten, late leader of band, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph L. Buckley, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Christopher C. Blake, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Wilkins, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

True W. Lovering, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli W. Adams, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lydia F. Goodaker, widow of Samuel C. Goodaker, late of Company M, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Mary I. Fawcett, widow of Thomas Fawcett, late of the United States Navy, \$12 per month.

Thomas B. Carey, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company F, Seventieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob Conrad, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose A. Mooney, now Reed, former widow of Julius C. Mooney, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Sallie A. Hawkes, widow of Erastus L. Hawkes, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and major, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, on page 14 I move to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, the pensioner having died.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14 it is proposed to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, in the following words:

The name of Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FEDERAL JUDGES.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to make inquiry and report the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge, etc., was next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, has Senate joint resolution 60 been called?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and it was passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been passed over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Would it be in order for me to move to take up the joint resolution at this time?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, what action was taken on the resolution just read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to put the question when interrupted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was on the floor, but did not observe that the joint resolution had been passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So soon as this resolution is disposed of it will be in order for any Senator to make a motion to take up any bill on the calendar. The question is on agreeing to Senate resolution 66.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me? I wish to say that I hope he will not make that motion this morning. I desire to look at the resolution, and I have not the time, of course, to do so now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I called up the joint resolution the other day, and was told that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] wished to offer an amendment; and I consented to have the matter go over until he could have an opportunity to do so. It is important that the resolution should be considered. I can not tell at what stage other business may intervene to prevent its consideration, and I beg the Senator not to insist upon a further postponement. I think I have shown sufficient consideration for those who wished to address themselves to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his motion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I must press my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of proceeding to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60 will rise. [A

pause.] All opposed will rise. [A pause.] The ayes have it, and the Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hitchcock	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Bryan	Husting	Norris	Sutherland
Cañon	James	O'Gorman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thomas
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thompson
Clapp	Jones	Phelan	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Colt	Kern	Poinexter	Underwood
Cummins	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Curtis	Lane	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Weeks
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	Lippitt	Sherman	Works
Gallinger	Lodge	Shields	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Tillman].

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Brady] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas a number of bills are now pending in Congress, having for their object the further regulation of carriers engaged in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has, from time to time, made recommendations to Congress in relation to the general subject of regulation, some of which are now under consideration but have not yet been acted on; and

Whereas a system of governmental regulation of interstate commerce has now been in effect for 28 years, during which period the extent and powers of regulation have been, from time to time, varied and enlarged, and there has thus been accumulated valuable experience for the guidance of Congress in the premises; and

Whereas the growth of interstate commerce and the enlargement of the powers and duties of regulation have so increased the exactions on the Interstate Commerce Commission as to necessitate, in the public interest, the consideration of the best method of dealing with the situation and of expediting the public business; and

Whereas adequate and well-managed transportation facilities constitute a prime necessity of business prosperity and are a common interest of all the people, and in order to afford these facilities and to enlarge them as the needs of commerce increase the credit of the carriers and proper regulation of their operations are matters of fundamental public concern; and

Whereas as a basis for any further legislation that may be undertaken by Congress in this regard the whole subject of governmental regulation should be deliberately and thoroughly studied in the light of the experience and suggestions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the carriers, of the shippers, and of the general public, with a view to adequately safeguarding the interests of the public, securing the establishment and maintenance of transportation facilities adequate to the needs of a growing and expanding commerce, and assuring to private owners and the investing public just consideration and protection of their legitimate rights of property:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress on or before the third Monday in December next; that a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment as follows:

On page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce" and insert "the subject of the Government control

and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding this joint resolution.

The purpose of the resolution is to make an exhaustive inquiry regarding interstate and foreign transportation, similar to the inquiry made by the National Monetary Commission regarding finance and banking. The resolution, however, does not provide for a commission, but for a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committees of the House and the Senate—5 Members from each; 10 in all.

Numerous bills have been introduced in both Houses looking to the regulation of railway securities, the increase in the membership and the division into branches or departments of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the national incorporation of great interstate railway systems, the relations between rail and water carriers, both river and ocean. The proposals were so numerous and varied, and the difference of opinion regarding them so great, that it was thought the coordinating of the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of interstate transportation would be instrumental in focusing the attention of Congress upon definite measures which would be framed after full hearing and discussion. Such measures would then go to the committees themselves for consideration and report to the respective bodies. The President had favored this view and had recommended action upon these lines. The proposed resolution provides for a subcommittee to be appointed from the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of the subject.

The resolution as originally introduced had provided in general terms for the investigation of the general subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. The committee by its amendment had changed this phraseology so as to authorize the committee to—

investigate the subject of Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers, and in promoting the public interest; the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and act to regulate commerce.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Borah] by his proposed amendment seeks to amend this by adding:

The subject of Government ownership of public utilities, such as telegraph, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities, and the comparative worth or efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and regulation.

I contend, Mr. President, that it would be much better to confine the proposed investigation to the question of Government regulation. That regulation has been thus far, in my judgment, highly successful, and it can be made more efficient through proper legislation. Unless, of course, regulation involves not only reasonable rates to the shippers but fair returns to the carriers, it will fail of its purpose, for a fair return to the carriers is essential in order to secure the investment of money in needed extensions and improvements, and unless the regulation results in fair rates to the shippers, the whole public purpose of the regulation fails. Logically we should complete and perfect public regulation before the question of public ownership is taken up. To investigate both questions at this time, when there are no fair methods of judgment or comparison, would produce confusion instead of certainty.

Of late years, until the foreign war stimulated the business of the country, the transportation interests had suffered, as have the other business interests of the country. Prior to the European war there was a gradual let down in business, industry, and production, which was necessarily reflected in the reduction of transportation. There has been no period in the history of transportation for the last 20 years in which the problem, so far as the finances of the railroads were concerned, was so serious. The railroads, having lost the political control which they once exercised, and being forced into the forum of public opinion, thought it wise to present their case to the public through addresses, pamphlets, and newspaper and magazine publications. The situation was one of diminishing traffic and increasing wages and taxes. They perhaps overstated their case, and the result was that whilst perhaps their appeals in a measure affected the public judgment and moderated governmental action regarding their activities, the effect was to alarm their own

stockholders and investors generally in railway securities and make it difficult for them to obtain the money needed for extensions and improvements. There had been no period in this generation, outside of the panic year of 1907, when it was so difficult for them to secure money. The negotiation of long-time bonds was impossible. The negotiation of short-time notes at high rates of interest was necessary, and the maturing of those notes from time to time increased their embarrassment.

The recent revival of industry has, of course, affected them favorably, and they are now approaching a time when it will be easier to make their negotiations; but all such negotiations would be hampered by a consideration and discussion of important questions relating to their regulation and control at a time when a presidential campaign is approaching and when the general inclination of both parties is to take a political rather than an economic view of such questions.

Besides this there are so many questions now pending before Congress relating to the civil war in Mexico and the international war abroad—questions of preparedness and questions of revenue—that it would be difficult to get a full consideration of the questions relating to transportation either by committees or by Congress. It appears wise, therefore, whilst providing for an intermediate inquiry, to postpone definite action until the period of calm shall come after the presidential election.

The language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to cover every possible inquiry regarding transportation without accentuating such inquiry as that which relates to Government ownership, an inquiry which might have the effect of producing uncertainty in arrangements that are now pending for the immediate financing of many railroads. I feel sure that logically full consideration of Government ownership should only come after the question of public regulation has been exhausted and its incompetency and inefficiency demonstrated. So far as I am concerned I feel greater confidence in the success of public regulation than ever. We have under it secured the most perfect railway system in the country with more reasonable rates of freight and fare than prevail anywhere in the world, and whilst there are still imperfections to be remedied it is evident that governmental ownership elsewhere had not evolved a system at all comparable with ours.

I refer to these considerations for the purpose of stating that, in my judgment, it is of the highest importance, both to the public, the shippers, and to the carriers themselves, that we should arrive at some rational solution of all the pending proposals without public excitement upon the subject. I think it would be a mistake to take up all the questions now by the respective committees of the Senate and House when both Congress and the country are intent more upon political than economic action and when the questions relating to existing international and civil war are so engrossing. It seems to me that the regulation of carriers is now reaching its crucial state. The carriers have found it difficult during this period to meet the demands of the country for expansion and enlargement, and that is a condition which is unfavorable to the shippers and to the business of the country.

I believe that public regulation is a success. I believe that it can be improved so as to make it more successful not only in the interest of the shippers themselves but in the interest of the carriers and with reference to the expansion and development of the railroad system to meet the requirements of the country. If the public regulation of railroads does not succeed, if it breaks down in any way, Government ownership must follow; but it seems to me that Government ownership can not logically be considered until the failure of public regulation is established.

Therefore, whilst the language of this resolution as reported by the committee would be broad enough if the committee saw fit to consider any well-considered scheme of Government ownership and report upon it, I would regard it as ill-advised to accept the amendment of the Senator from Idaho regarding the Government ownership of all public utilities. I believe that it would accentuate that form of governmental control. I do not believe that the committee will have time to enter upon that subject as it ought and make its proper recommendations with reference to the improvement of the regulation of the railroads of the country. Such an inquiry will be a very extensive one when made, involving an inquiry at very great expense, not only into local conditions but into conditions throughout the world, a careful examination of all the prevailing systems of Government ownership, and a comparison with our own.

I am, therefore, opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, not so much because I am disinclined at some time to enter upon such an inquiry, but simply because

I think this is not the time logically for it, and I would not wish to emphasize in the public mind the idea that the Congress of the United States regards public regulation as a failure and is now prepared to enter upon the consideration of Government ownership.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that in the absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] the Senator from Nevada is offering the amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Senator from Idaho has been here. I supposed he was here. He was here when I commenced my remarks.

Mr. BRYAN. May I inquire of the Senator from Nevada if the language printed in italics is what he refers to when speaking of the Borah amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Borah amendment is a separate printed amendment. The amendment in italics is the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has offered no amendment. The Chair heard the Senator from Nevada read it, and was in doubt as to whether the Senator from Nevada intended to offer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I understood the Senator from Idaho had given notice that he would offer it, and I thought it proper in my preliminary remarks to call attention to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada why it was that the proposed law carrying out the platform pledge of his party, as I understood it was for that purpose, providing for the regulation of stocks and bonds of interstate railroads, was allowed to die after it had passed the House and then been reported by the Senate committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate? Why is it that now we should want to make an investigation as to whether we ought to pass anything of that kind when I supposed it had been determined at least by the Senator's own party that such a law was necessary?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator that a bill was passed in the House of Representatives providing for the control by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the securities issued by interstate carriers. That bill came to the Senate and was reported to the Senate with amendments. The understanding of the committee when that report was made was that the bill provided for the absolute control by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a national authority, of the securities of railway carriers, and it was assumed, though it was not expressed in the bill in that connection, that under the decision of the Supreme Court such a control exercised under national authority would practically oust the jurisdiction of the State commissions regarding the securities of carriers engaged in interstate commerce but organized under the laws of the respective States. After that report was made Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission and urged that it would be exceedingly unwise to provide for the absolute control of these securities; that in some way the Nation might be committed to existing issues which might have been unlawfully or wrongfully made and would be estopped from attacking them hereafter; and they insisted upon it that the supervision of the national commission should be confined simply to requiring statements from these carriers to the Interstate Commerce Commission and their full publicity, thus relying upon publicity as a control and a corrective rather than upon the absolute control of the commission. The views of Mr. Brandeis were sustained by some of the members of the committee, whose attention, I presume, had for the first time been called to the importance of the subject, and it was apparent that unless the matter were reconsidered by the committee there would be a long and protracted debate on the floor of the Senate over that question.

We were then toward the close of a long session, during which the most important questions relating to banking and trade had been considered. Congress was wearied and it was thought inadvisable to press the bill at that Congress. That Congress was followed by the last session, a short session, and then as the result of mutual consultation, particularly upon this side of the House, with reference to a legislative program which could be put through in so short a session, it was not deemed wise to bring up that measure.

We are now in a long session, but we are approaching a political campaign, and, as the Senator knows, politics have much more consideration in such a Congress, and always have had, than economics. It is therefore deemed wise to have both committees, through a subcommittee, act upon all these various measures that have been presented with a view to sifting them

thoroughly, holding public hearings and making a report as soon as practicable, thus presenting to their respective committees their concrete judgment as to the measures to be enacted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question before he sits down. Does the Senator believe that the Senate and Congress and the President and the entire country ought to suspend operations after it was, I think, conceded, at least by the Senator's party and a great many others, including myself, that it ought to be passed, after it had passed the House and been reported favorably by his committee to the Senate, because two men, Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee, appeared before the committee and requested suspension of action, that the entire country ought to halt and wait? If it be true that it was only a question of waiting, why is it that at the beginning of this Congress the Senator and his committee having had all the information before it did not propose the bill that had so nearly been passed before? Why is it necessary to investigate further?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Nevada will allow me, I desire to say that while I am sure the chairman of the committee wishes to be absolutely accurate, as a member of the committee and one who has heard the statement that he has just made, I am bound to dissent from some of its details. I can not agree that the Committee on Interstate Commerce suspended or abandoned the bill which the Senator from Nebraska refers to because it did not meet the views of Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee. Whatever effect their views may have had on members of the committee, I am sure the Senator from Nevada does not mean to say that the committee itself accepted the opinions of these gentlemen, eminent as they are, and through their advice or influence reached the conclusion that no further efforts would be made to pass the bill. There were some of us who were very anxious that the bill should be pressed at all times, not only during the latter part of the long session but during the short session as well.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not think the words which I used could convey the impression at all that we suspended operations simply because Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before our committee. There were several members of the committee who had given most thorough and conscientious consideration to all the railway problems that have involved us for years who seemed inclined to sympathize with that view. It was perfectly apparent that a long debate and contention would take place over the bill and that it would be impossible to conclude it at the long session of Congress.

I will further state that the business of the committee is not suspended and will not be suspended by the adoption of this joint resolution. It is entirely within the province of the Interstate Commerce Committee to take up any of the measures that are now pending before it.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask him another question there?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. If the passage of this joint resolution will not suspend the operations of the committee, I should like to ask the Senator if, notwithstanding the passage of the joint resolution, the committee of which the Senator has the honor to be the chairman expects soon to report to Congress the bill, or a similar bill, providing for the limitation of the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not state what the committee expects to do. I am, however, willing at any time to bring before that committee any measure that is presented in the Congress of the United States by any Senator, and to bring it up on the request of a Senator for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is chairman of the committee; he has the same authority and influence with the committee that chairmen generally have; and he is perhaps often authorized to speak by those in control of his party on matters that are the subject of party consideration; and so I should like to ask him whether he intends to press such a measure. Is it the intention of the Senator, so far as he can control his committee, to bring out a bill here that will regulate the issuance of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers, regardless of the joint resolution which is now pending?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not accept any language which indicates that I have any control over the committee. That committee is composed of gentlemen of intelligence and independence, and the committee acts according to its own judgment, not according to mine. If, however, the Senator asks me as to my

personal views, I shall be very candid with him and will give them.

I believe that as to all the measures which relate to securities, which relate to the reorganization of the commission, and to other important amendments of the interstate-commerce act, it would be wise to turn over their consideration to a subcommittee proposed to be appointed by this joint resolution, if it passes, and to defer action upon them until we get their report. I believe that in that way we shall get a more perfect scheme of legislation than we shall get by two committees of Congress acting in a detached way upon these very important questions at a time when the country is intent upon political rather than economic questions, and when most important questions relating to finance, revenue, and pending wars are absorbing our attention.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. STONE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, with the nominal purpose of the pending resolution I am in accord. Any real information intended to make the Interstate Commerce Commission more useful, to rid it of unnecessary burdens, to strengthen it in its ability to carry out the purposes for which it was created should be obtained; and while I have little faith in investigations by men with fixed and preconceived ideas on the subjects to be investigated, still I can imagine that the commission or committee proposed, if constituted of men who will recognize and report facts, whether pleasant or otherwise, and who will devote the study and work contemplated by this resolution, can be of service to the Congress in its future considerations of the interstate-commerce law. I am going to support the resolution on that theory. It is proper, however, that the Senate should know the possibilities under the measure and the immediate cause of its appearance here.

I am informed by credible authority that this resolution has the indorsement of the President. He is reported as saying that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that the railroads should be untrammelled. He also desires, in the interest of nonpartisan legislation, that the proposed committee shall not report until after election. I think he is not likely to be disappointed in the last particular, for the work to be performed by the committee would more likely require two years to complete it than that it could be completed in eight months.

If the President also desired that no interstate-commerce legislation be enacted until after election, this resolution would furnish an excellent excuse to his followers in Congress to postpone such legislation. Of course, whether action on new matters is had or not will rest with Congress, but, judging the future by the past, I have no doubt of the potency of the President's wish in this regard.

I appreciate the President's desire for nonpartisan legislation. It is novel to this administration. Perhaps he has in mind his preparedness program, which has no hope except by the aid of Republicans. I have known that in Democratic as well as in Republican administrations not all of wisdom or patriotism rests with majorities.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to preface my question with the statement that I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan in his expression as to the desirability of having this work done in a nonpartisan way. I myself believe that all legislation ought to be nonpartisan, and that is what suggested the question. The regulation of stocks and bonds was a plank in the platform of the Democratic Party. I myself approve it and believe in it; but when that party undertook to carry out that part of the platform, all at once, for some unseen cause, the program seemed to have been changed and stopped. Now, I want to ask the Senator if this is not politics, and nothing but politics—if it is not merely to lay a foundation so as to give an excuse when going before the country in the coming campaign for not having complied with the agreement they made with the people in their platform adopted at Baltimore in regard to the issuance of stocks and bonds?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I had hoped to express myself on that subject when I reached the point, although I confess that I had not paid much attention to the Baltimore platform, as I did not suppose that it had any binding force upon Democrats at this time. If it contains any unbroken plank, I do not know which it is.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe in the coming national campaign as to whatever

part of the Baltimore platform has not been complied with—which will probably be a large share of it—the Democrats will have various excuses as to why it was not complied with, and is not this joint resolution the foundation of an excuse for not having done one of the things promised in the Baltimore platform?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think that is entirely probable. But the expressed excuse for this resolution is the statement that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that there is need for more favorable treatment of the railroads. Now, I agree that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as strong with the people as it was 18 months ago, but I probably can not agree with the President as to the cause of its lessened strength, and certainly if the railroads are unjustly shackled I want to know it and to assist in breaking those shackles, for an injury to the railroads is an injury to the people.

It is my belief that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as popular with the people as it was prior to its last decision in the 5 per cent rate-increase case, and when the people lose confidence in the commission its usefulness becomes impaired. I have never complained at increases of rates allowed by the commission when its decisions were based upon the law governing rates, viz. "they shall be just and reasonable," and this has been construed by the courts to mean sufficient to yield a reasonable return to the carrier upon the property actually employed for the public use. The railroads should have a right to such returns, but the makers of that law never expected that it would be construed to guarantee profit under any management however faulty, nor to pay dividends on stock however attenuated with water. In other words, the commission was not created to establish a policy for the control of carriers' finances. The first decision of the commission denying the 5 per cent raise was right under the law and the submitted evidence. The railroads had not attempted to prove the justness and reasonableness of the rates in the proposed schedules. They simply said "we need the money." The second decision, six months later than the first, reversed the former on exactly the same state of facts and without any additional testimony except that the European war had broken out. What a blanket for covering mistakes that war has furnished this administration! Why the war created revenue for the carriers. It did not reduce their net incomes.

Now, I have great faith in the character and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has always been composed of good and capable men. It is one of the most useful branches of the public service. The final decision in the 5 per cent rate increase case shows that a majority of that commission, however, are very human.

They yielded, I believe, to Executive suggestion. I do not know that the President talked with members of the commission after that first decision, but I do know—if newspaper reports are to be believed—that railroad officials in influential numbers called upon the President and that he was reported as being out of harmony with that decision and as favoring the proposed increase. I do know that the commission reversed itself and thereby lost some of the confidence of the people. The people should understand, however, that the commission has not, to my knowledge, followed that decision as a precedent, although railroad attorneys have invoked it.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created as a people's tribunal. The railroads were under the law given the right to appeal to the court, but the shipper was allowed no such privilege. The commission was supposed to act for him. It could even proceed in his behalf on its own initiative. Why should he be permitted to ask for a review of his agents' acts? Of course, the commission should not be permitted to do wrong to a carrier, for, I repeat, a wrong to a railroad is a wrong to the patrons of that road and to the State, but it should be exceedingly zealous in safeguarding the rights of the people.

The pendulum seems to have swung to the opposite extreme. A few years ago railroad baiting and illy considered railroad legislation was the business of some men, and now the "public-damned" policy seems to be more popular. I am willing that a committee be appointed to investigate the interstate-commerce law, but I want it to report facts to the end that unwise laws may be repealed and new legislation enacted to carry out the purposes of the act of 1906.

I know that the Interstate Commerce Commission is overloaded with work. It has been the dumping ground for all kinds of legislative enactments, which have required much time and which should have been assigned to other agencies.

From the very nature of things it can not personally consider the thousand matters submitted to it. It can not even read the testimony taken by its agents in the hundreds of rate and

regulation cases brought before it. I doubt if it is possible for its members, individually, to read the more than 2,000 legal briefs presented to them annually. A great part of this work is done by examiners. Some of these examiners have been forced upon the commission by high political influence. All, or nearly all, are paid insufficient salaries; that is, the salaries in many cases are not sufficient to secure permanently men big enough for the job and many of them are not capable of performing the great work to which they are assigned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's statement, almost startling, that incompetent men are forced upon the commission through political influence suggests a question to me. I want to ask the Senator whether, in view of that statement, it would not be almost necessary to amend the pending joint resolution by providing that the committee shall investigate as to whether political influence, proceeding from any political party at any time, has been instrumental in pushing onto the commission appointees who in reality have to do work which the law really contemplated the commission should do?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution is broad enough to cover that, if the committee has a disposition to do it. I think it is a serious matter. I am mentioning these things on the assumption that the commission is breaking down; and I want to find out, if I can, why this is so. If it is so. Some of these examiners are high-grade men, but they seize the first opportunity to accept better positions outside the commission. Their experience with the commission makes them valuable to private and corporate interests, and they very properly accept the more remunerative employment. If this proposed committee shall show the true situation in reference to these and similar matters, it will be worth while.

The commission has not broken down and it will not break down if Congress does not ask it to do things impossible of performance, if it is not loaded down with incompetent political subordinates, and if it is not coerced by Executive influence.

I shall vote for this resolution, because it is reasonably possible that the joint committee created by it may disclose facts which will enable and induce Congress to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission in its efforts to perform its duties in an unprejudiced and fearless manner under the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know what these law examiners are paid annually?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think one or two get around \$5,000, and their salaries range from that figure down.

Mr. SHERMAN. Five thousand dollars is the maximum?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand that is the highest salary that is paid to an examiner, although I am not certain that there may not be exceptional cases.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator think that compensation or a lower one will secure a high type of legal ability?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I have been saying that I did not think the salaries were sufficient, because the work of these examiners is of the very highest importance. It is of almost as much importance, possibly, as that of the commissioners themselves. So this question ought to be investigated, and a report made.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield further to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. If I understand the duties of these examiners, some of whom I have the good fortune to know personally, let me inquire if their examination of the questions that are referred to them is not reduced to writing and reported back to the commission, and whether in the main the commission does not adopt the report of the examiner as the decision of the commission?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the commission is compelled to do that. It can not read these cases. It is an absolute impossibility for it to do so. It must rely very largely upon the reports of the examiners.

Mr. SHERMAN. These examiners ought to be possessed of excellent ability, ought they not? Because they are the ones who make the original examination, and hear the witnesses, and arrive at conclusions, and report them back.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think so. So, Mr. President, I say that I am in favor of the resolution if some of these matters shall

have been investigated impartially and fearlessly, with an idea, not of bolstering up some particular theory, but of strengthening the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is the people's forum. It was created as a people's forum.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he favors the enactment by Congress of a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to regulate the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not sure whether I do or not. I have been in favor of that proposition. I am not entirely clear about it now. Possibly if I could frame the law I might be in favor of it; but knowing, as I do know, that a result might occur that would be detrimental rather than beneficial, without doing any good to anybody, I should hesitate to say as a general proposition that I am in favor of a law to that effect.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is in favor of any legislation, such as has been repeatedly suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that would regulate some of the admitted evils? I will put it broadly, and ask the Senator whether there is any legislation in regard to the regulation of railroads that he now favors?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That I now favor?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that the Senator would like to see enacted into law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is possible that some durable legislation facilitating railroad financing may be necessary. I would prefer that Congress enact it rather than to permit the commission to do it.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator believe that this very resolution that we are going to adopt will be used as a buffer to prevent the enactment of that legislation, and that the cry will always go up, "You must wait two or three years more until this joint committee reports"?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I said at the beginning of my remarks that that was possible under this resolution. If the President—and I say "President" because he has been very potent in matters of legislation—should desire that no legislation be considered, either before the election or afterwards during his term, I think his desire would have a good chance of being carried out; for while Congress has the power to consider and pass legislation regardless of this resolution, yet the probabilities are that if any effective legislation, at least, is offered, this resolution will be presented as a buffer—to use the Senator's term—to prevent its consideration. I think it is possible.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan further yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator favor us with his opinion as to the cause of over 40,000 miles of railways in the United States being operated by receivers at the present time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I do not believe I will go into that, Mr. President, because, really—

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it an absence of legislation or too much?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think it is due to the absence of any law that makes the robbery of the stockholders of a railroad company, such as happened in the case of the New Haven, the Rock Island, and the Frisco, a crime? Is it not because the law at present permits those who ought to represent the stockholders to take advantage of their position of trust to sell them out, as was done in every one of those instances?

In other words, does not the Senator believe that because the ordinary investor knows that the stock of any railroad may be manipulated in that way, and therefore made unsafe, he refuses to invest in it, and that makes of it, as a matter of fact, to a great extent a gambling institution? Ought not a law to be passed that would prevent the kind of a situation that has been illustrated by the roads I have mentioned, and would not that place the stock of all railroads upon a basis that would invite the honest investor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Answering the last question first, I do not know whether it would or not. If such a law can be passed, and if such a condition is due to the lack of law in that respect, of course, I would be in favor of passing it; but I do not know always just exactly what causes that condition. I know that seemingly excellent laws are passed sometimes, but bad conditions still exist; and I am quite inclined to agree with the sug-

gestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that as a general proposition we have too much law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just wanted to cite one more instance, in addition to the cases mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, where it seemed to me that the unregulated capitalization of a railroad company may bring about a receivership, and that is the case of the Union Pacific Railroad. It has been described on this floor a number of times, and I will only mention it in outline again.

The result of the transaction was that the Union Pacific Railroad is incumbered with \$100,000,000 of indebtedness with no corresponding property in return. The earning capacity of the railroad was not increased by incurring the \$100,000,000 of indebtedness. It is perfectly obvious that in a situation of that kind it is more difficult for the railroad company to meet its obligations. If it goes in debt without any return it is very likely, even in normal times, the condition described by the Senator from Illinois may result.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have said all I care to say on this subject, and conclude practically as I began with the statement that I am in favor of any commission that will honestly investigate and get at the facts upon which Congress can proceed to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first amendment of the committee to the joint resolution.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is this on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to be heard on that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no special objection to this particular amendment, but I desire to be heard at some length on the joint resolution itself. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I shall not be able to conclude what I have to say at 2 o'clock, and I was not ready to go on to-day. That was the reason why I asked the Senator in the beginning not to make his motion to take up this joint resolution to-day. If it is necessary, however, I presume I can take up the time until 2 o'clock. I do not care to do that. I am perfectly willing to vote on this amendment if the Senator would be willing then that the matter should go over until I can look up a few things that I am not ready to take up at the present time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am afraid I will not have another opportunity of bringing up this matter.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must realize that 2 o'clock will soon be here. He will have just as much time to-morrow as he had to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am inclined to think the Philippine bill will be temporarily laid aside to enable us to complete the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. That will take unanimous consent, will it not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think it will. I think it can be done on motion.

Mr. NORRIS. We will see, when we reach it, what it will take. Of course I can take up—as I will have to take up, if the Senator insists on it, and no one else wants to talk—about three times as much time as I would necessarily take if I had a few hours to arrange what I have to say. Since, however, the Senator does not feel inclined to grant me that reasonable request I will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Might not we dispose of these amendments, if the Senator has no objection?

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection. If the Senator was willing, I was willing to concede that much to dispose of these amendments and let the resolution progress that far; but he is not willing, when they are disposed of, to lay the joint resolution over until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. It will take five minutes to dispose of the amendments, and we will be that far along to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but I do not feel disposed to yield now, unless the Senator would be willing that the joint resolution should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CATRON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Nelson	Sterling
Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Stone
Beckham	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Borah	Hollis	Oliver	Swanson
Brandeggee	Hughes	Overman	Thomas
Bryan	Husting	Page	Tillman
Cañon	James	Phelan	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Underwood
Chilton	Kenyon	Poinexter	Vardaman
Clapp	Kern	Reed	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Sherman	Williams
Dillingham	McLean	Shields	Works
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIPLEY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce, and let it stand for the day, the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness.

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement that I made on the former roll call as to my colleague [Mr. GOFF] being absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] whether he has any objection to the Philippine government bill being temporarily laid aside in order that we may complete the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long it would probably take to finish the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have heard of but two Senators who desire to speak, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEWLANDS. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it will not, in my judgment, take near as much time if the resolution should go over for a day or two as it would take if proceeded with now. I have not looked at some records that I want to examine. I have no desire to delay the resolution, I want to say to the Senator, although I want to be heard somewhat at length. If I have to go on to-day I shall have to stumble through a great deal of stuff that I would probably eliminate if I had a little time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will also say to the Senator from Nevada that I desire to speak a short time on the resolution, and if he should undertake to force it through this afternoon I promise him it will not pass to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that it requires unanimous consent to lay the Philippine government bill aside. Can it be done on motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done by motion, of course, but it displaces the Philippine government bill in case the motion is sustained by the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course I would not want to bring about that effect. So I assume the resolution will have to go over. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] whether he will be prepared to go on at the close of the morning business to-morrow?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so, as far as I know, unless investigations I intend to make should go further than I expect. I have no disposition to put it over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have had no disposition to cut him off from a full opportunity to debate the resolution, but I have made several attempts to bring it up. The other day I postponed its consideration upon the request of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and upon his assurance that he would help secure the early disposition of the resolution. I should like the Senator from Nebraska to unite with me in bringing the matter to an early conclusion.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not try to delay it for the purpose of delay. I have tried to delay it to-day because I was not ready to go on and would not do so unless I was forced to proceed. I

want a little time to get some of the records together that I wish to use.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I give notice, then, that to-morrow morning at the close of the routine morning business I shall call up the resolution for action.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have just had a call for a quorum, I am going to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill and all pending amendments may be passed to a final vote not later than 3 o'clock on Thursday of this week.

Mr. SMOOT. I think under the rule that request could not be complied with now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that under the rule it will be necessary to have a call of the roll before the request for unanimous consent can be put. There has been intervening business between the former roll call of the Senate and the present time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, for information, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether there would be any objection to such a request?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] is out of the Chamber just at this moment. I think he is at lunch. I do not believe the question ought to be asked in his absence, even in the way the Senator has put it. I could not say, as far as I am concerned, whether there is any objection to setting a day certain for a vote or not.

Mr. LIPPITT entered the Chamber.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Rhode Island has entered the Chamber. I will state to him that I am making an informal inquiry whether there would be objection to fixing an hour on a day for a final vote on the bill and all pending amendments.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, until the pending amendment, what is known as the Clarke amendment, is disposed of I think it would not be easy to get a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a day for voting on the bill. It seems to me that no one knows to just how much discussion that amendment is going to lead. I know several Senators who are inclined to express an opinion in regard to it. So I think it would not be a favorable time to make the request, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. I personally have no disposition at all to delay a vote on the bill.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate very briefly in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The Filipino people are now engaged, with our help, in solving the problem of popular government, and if we grant them independence in the near future it is manifest that they will undertake to establish a system of popular government in some form; in other words, a government by the people and without the aid of a monarch or an aristocracy.

Now, it is clear from the experience of every nation which has tried to establish a stable popular government that we are not giving the Filipino people sufficient time in two or four years to work out this problem.

Can we expect the Filipino people to accomplish something which France was unable to accomplish, which Spain was unable to accomplish, which the Central and South American Republics were unable to accomplish, and which no nation in the world which has made the attempt has been able to accomplish?

It took France 80 years, from 1790 to 1870, to establish a stable popular government, and before she was successful her Government was three times overturned by the populace of Paris, three times by the army, three times by foreign invaders, while one constitution succeeded another in rapid succession. Can we expect more of the Filipino people than of the French people?

The efforts of Spain to establish popular government began in 1812, and after some 40 military insurrections it has ended in a restoration of monarchy; and the experience of France and Spain has been the experience of other European nations in their attempts to establish popular government during the past century, with the possible exception of Switzerland.

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, we are all familiar with the history of the Central and South American Republics and the length of time it took them to establish a stable popular government. It is safe to say that it was 50 years from

the times these colonies of Spain declared their independence before they succeeded in this undertaking.

Not to mention minor insurrections, there were more than 80 revolutions in these Republics during the first half century of their existence. Mr. Meyer, of the Library of Congress, has given me some data on this subject, which I ask to be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Data in relation to revolutions in South American and Central American States and in Mexico.
[Not including minor insurrections.]

Country.	Date of liberation.	Number of revolutions during first half century.
South America:		
Argentina.....	1812	7
Bolivia.....	1825	7
Brazil.....	1822	1
Chile.....	1818	13
Colombia.....	1819	5
Ecuador.....	1822	3
Paraguay.....	1811	(¹)
Peru.....	1821	6
Uruguay.....	1830	8
Venezuela.....	1819	4
Mexico.....	1813	10
Central America:		
Costa Rica.....	1821	1
Guatemala.....	1821	8
Honduras.....	1821	7
Nicaragua.....	1821	4
Salvador.....	1821	1
Total.....		85

¹ Practical dictatorship.

Mr. COLT. From this compilation it appears that there were 13 revolutions in Chile during the first 50 years of her independence, 7 in Argentina, 7 in Bolivia, 6 in Peru, 5 in Colombia, and 10 in Mexico. The number of revolutions in the other Republics will be found in the annexed paper.

And it may be observed in this connection that it took us, with all our experience in self-government, some 13 years, or from 1776 to 1789, before we succeeded in establishing a stable, popular government.

When we consider the history of popular government and the present conditions in the Philippines, I am convinced that it is impossible for the Filipino people to establish a stable popular government in two or four years, and hence that it would be an act of injustice toward them and a breach of good faith on the part of the United States to grant them independence at the time proposed in this amendment.

As to the second proposition contained in this amendment, I am unable to see how the United States can, during the present war, obtain any pledge from other nations guaranteeing the sovereignty and independence of the Philippines; and, if the times were normal, I can find no sufficient ground upon which the great powers would enter into any such obligation. If this should turn out to be true, and the United States alone should guarantee the independence of the Philippines for five years after parting with our sovereignty, then we are left in the position of assuming a responsibility without the power of enforcing it. For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against this amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not share the views of able Senators who have spoken upon this question with reference to the attitude of Japan toward this Government or of the attitude of Japan with reference to our possession of the Philippines. I do not believe that the Japanese people are seeking difficulty with the United States, and I have never seen anything which indicated to me that our possession of the Philippines was at all irritating to those people or to the Japanese Government. In any event, any vote that I shall cast upon this amendment or the bill will in no wise be colored or controlled by what is supposed to be the attitude of Japan or any other nation toward the United States. I look upon it as a matter which concerns the United States alone and its policy. What is our interest and what is our duty toward the Philippine people? When I shall have determined to my satisfaction these questions I shall not be concerned about the supposed views or supposed irritableness of other nations.

Neither do I believe, I desire to say by way of digression, that there is any great power seeking difficulty or anticipating

trouble with the United States. Our troubles at the present time with other nations arise not out of any specific desire on the part of those nations to have difficulty with the United States but simply because their great interests and our interests inevitably under the conditions which are now prevailing conflict. It is quite natural for those powers, struggling as they are for existence, to urge their rights and to pursue their policies to the limit, and it is quite proper that the United States should guard its own interests. But whatever the difficulties are or may have been, it has never occurred to me that we ought to interpret the situation as we find it now throughout the world, and the difficulties which now present themselves to us as a desire upon the part of any nation to have difficulty with the United States. I do not believe that any of the belligerent nations are pursuing a course with a view of bringing about unfriendly relations. It has been assumed that because of Japan's favor to the allies in this war that the allies would be bound to join in any ambitious program which Japan might have at the close of the war, and that therein is to be found a menace to the United States.

Nations do not act upon the moral obligations of yesterday but upon the primary interests of to-day. They do not consider in making up their policies the friendships and relations of the past, but the advantages and opportunities of the present or the future. It seems in these days that even treaty obligations are of slight or no consequence as against present exigencies or future expectations. The alliances of this supreme tragedy may last a little longer than usual by reason of the fearful welding, but even they will yield to the changing interest and lurking jealousies of the swift coming years. Only a short time ago Japan and Russia were at war, and we see them now in practical alliance. We see Germany and England within most recent years in the friendliest relationship. We see them now in deadly conflict. I do not get much enlightenment or imbibe any considerable fear from the present alliances. If you will tell me where the vital and material interest of this or that nation will lie a decade from now, I will tell you something of the dangers of attack from that source. But if you undertake to talk to me of the present alliances and friendships and from these to deduce future programs and actions I am unable to become very deeply interested or greatly alarmed. We do not know what the future interests will be, and therefore we do not know what the future alliances will be. All the more reason why we should be constantly prepared. The patriotism of a people is a noble but a singular virtue. It ignores the appeal of past friendships and soon forgets the insults of former enemies.

So, Mr. President, any condition which may be presented at this time as to the supposed attitude or state of mind of any great power would have nothing to do with any vote which I might cast upon this bill.

In saying that I do not believe that Japan is seeking trouble with this country or that either the central powers or the allies are formulating plans or nursing designs looking to an immediate attack upon the United States dependent only on the result of the war, I do not, of course, argue against a reasonable program of preparedness. I would assist, however, if I could, in raising the discussion of so vital a problem out of the region of temporary fear, based upon conditions which may pass with the hour, into the region of deliberate conviction based upon those sound and permanent principles which must accompany national power so long as it endures. Under the leadership of Col. Roosevelt, eight or nine years ago, I voted for four battleships to be at once constructed, and to be followed by a policy which would have given in this hour not a third-rate but in any event a second-rate Navy. I voted then as I did because I could not well understand how a great Nation with thousands of miles of seacoast and a stupendous wealth at the water's edge, with its commerce extending to and ramifying all parts of the earth and entering upon its career of world power, could safely be without a great Navy. It seemed to me to be as indispensable to our national honor and prestige as any other great principle upon which the Republic is founded; that in the vicissitudes of human affairs there may come a time, and no man knoweth in advance the time, when force, and nothing but force, would mean safety, mean civilization, mean national integrity, mean national honor.

Washington, in his inaugural address, said:

There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be imperiled, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

That is the principle, permanent and abiding, as essential before the war as now, upon which to build your program of preparedness. Not upon the theory of some supposed specific plan of attack, more likely false than true, but upon the prin-

ciple and the same principle that you police your cities—simply because so long as men are human disorders will sometimes arise, and so long as nationalism is the basis upon which human societies are organized conflicts will sometimes come. I have no faith in the permanency or effectiveness of any program of preparedness superinduced by or based upon present disturbances or conflicts. A policy begun in fear will end in failure. When the supposed causes seem to pass interest in the program will pass. Your arguments will no longer be backed up by concrete examples and your appropriations will cease. But a program, sir, based upon the broad and serene policy of Washington, as clear visioned and as long visioned as that of his doctrine of neutrality, and sustained by every truly great American from that hour to this, a program based upon education and intelligent conviction of the effect that it is indispensable to national safety and power at all times, will have some chance of being permanent and effective.

Take a lesson from recent history and see how futile are the plans and programs founded on passing incidents and how essential it is that we dig deeper and build, as Washington and Hamilton built, upon the verities of human nature and human experience as they are gathered not of a day but through the long sweep of the years. The spring of 1914 was the richest in promise of peace in the whole history of the world. The fringe of the millenium seemed to be lingering about the horizon everywhere. Another peace conference was soon to be held at The Hague. We were just getting ready to celebrate the centenary of the treaty of Ghent. Everybody was writing treaties. The Senate was ratifying them without discussion or consideration, provided they looked like peace treaties. Rulers were signing them with ostentatious ceremony.

The sleeping qualities of the human heart seemed really to be aroused and prepared to dominate all human conduct and all nations and all peoples, all races and all religions were soon to be united in a bond of universal peace, unending and unbreakable, and human misunderstandings, selfishness, and passion and war were to be known no more. One of the great peace advocates of the world declared in exultation that the world would never again witness a great war. But, sir, in August came the world conflict. The delegates to The Hague were interrupted in their journey by the submarines and the Zeppelins. Beneath the surface so calm and pacific were the old, ugly passions and prejudices and ambitions of men. Not only was the millenium postponed, but it is a serious question if civilization has not gone back many a decade. I would have no hopes, Mr. President, of any reasonable, permanent, and helpful program of preparedness if we are to continue to make this supposed enemy the moving power of the program. This great conflict has served to awaken and to startle, but it has not changed the principles upon which a nation should always build its program of preparedness.

I have digressed, Mr. President, from the discussion of the Philippine question to say this much upon this subject, because so much has been said and has been well said, so far as that is concerned, as to the supposition that our dealing with the Philippines and, indeed, our entire program of preparedness should be based rather upon conditions as they now present themselves than upon those great principles which, in my judgment, obtain just as much in peace as in war.

Mr. President, I want now to discuss for a time the Philippine question. It seems to me that there are two propositions, or two courses, or two policies, open to us in dealing with the Philippines. The first is to get out of the Philippines now, or as soon as we may, taking into consideration the necessity of certain delay necessary to the transfer of government. There is no doubt, I think, that this policy would be to the best interest of the United States if we were to view the matter wholly as a question of material interest or material welfare. I think that most of us, if we could roll back and reconstruct or redirect the events of the last quarter of a century, would leave the Philippine Islands just as we found them. I think most of us feel that it would have been better. But circumstances unusual prevailed which seemed to necessitate assuming the sovereignty over those islands. If we were now clear of the islands, our sovereignty withdrawn, so far as the people of the United States are concerned as to their material interests, it would be considered as altogether to our advantage. Any proposition to withdraw sovereignty within a reasonable time—that is, as soon as the transfer of the reins of government and the adjustment of American interests can be effected—has for its support the material interests of the people of the United States. I am bound to say, however, that if the Filipino people would be content to remain indefinitely and the people of the United States would eliminate all politics and settle down to the task

of training them for a higher civilization, that immediate withdrawal would not be for the best interest of the Filipino people themselves. It is the "if," however, which seems insurmountable.

The second proposition, Mr. President, is that of remaining in the Philippines until we shall have done something substantial and permanent in the way of instructing the Filipinos in self-government—in self-government as we understand it, because we have no capacity for teaching self-government upon any other plan. When we talk of teaching self-government in the Philippines it must necessarily be to some extent in harmony with the views of self-government as we entertain those views; in other words, if we stay there any longer than the necessary time to get out, it must be that we are staying there for the benefit of the Filipino people themselves—that we are not staying there for the benefit of the United States or for any material interest which the United States could have.

If we remain in the Philippines for the purpose of performing this obligation—that is, of teaching the Filipino people free government and the capacity to maintain independence—a practical question arises, namely, how long will it take us to perform that task? How long will it take to reconstruct the conception of government which is entertained by those people, if indeed any idea of government is entertained by them at all? After we determine, if we can, how long it will take, then is there anyone willing to declare that we are to remain there until the task is completed? If we do not stay until such time as we shall have accomplished the task in its fullness, will we have benefited them at all? In other words, can we accomplish anything there in the next 10 years or 15 years or 20 years or 25 or 30 or 35 or 40 years in the way of permanent value of permanent good to the Filipino people? I believe that if we were to leave the Filipino people within the next 2 or 3 or 4 years, they would be benefited by our presence there just as much as if we should stay there for 15 or 20 years, and then leave them. I say this for the reason that no people in the history of the world have ever acquired anything like a capacity for self-government within less than centuries. It has never been possible under any conditions for a people to acquire that great power except through centuries of struggle and sacrifice, even when they have had the guiding hand and controlling influence of higher and more civilized nations to lead them.

I think, therefore, the question presents itself in this way: Are we going to remain there until we fulfill the obligation in its entirety upon the basis of teaching those people the capacity for self-government? If so, how long will it take? As has been said by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COTT], it will not only take decades, but it will take decades upon decades to accomplish that. In other words, in so far as we can now foresee or formulate plans, it means the permanent holding of the Philippine Islands.

The Anglo-Saxon race was from 500 to 1,000 years in acquiring a capacity for self-government. France has been not only decades but centuries in working out the problem of self-government. For more than a hundred years the Mexican people have been struggling with the question of self-government, and, in my judgment, they are no nearer to it to-day than they were at the time that Hidalgo raised the insurrection of about 1810 and based his fight upon the principle of a true democracy.

The veneer of democracy is one thing and easily created. But real democracy, government by the people, is a wholly different thing and the most difficult of all governments to construct and maintain. The outward form of republicanism or democracy signifies nothing. It may conceal the most cruel, corrupt, and oppressive absolutism, as is instanced in the history of Mexico for the last 30 years. The most difficult lesson for a people to learn and the most elusive and difficult to retain after it has been learned is the lesson of self-government. The most tormenting problem ever given to a people for demonstration is the problem of democracy. It has its manifest blessings when wrought out to success, every one of which blessings, however, are purchased and enjoyed only through the most exacting devotion and the most inflexible public interest upon the part of an entire people. There can be no basic foundation for such a government other than the most widespread and thoroughly disseminated knowledge and character upon the part of the people. No people have ever acquired the capacity for self-government except through decades and centuries of the most grievous experience. Why talk to these people of independence now? They have not, as a people, the slightest conception of the duties, the sacrifices, and the obligations of free government. They have not as yet mastered the first lesson. To delude them into the belief that they are fit for self-government or that they soon will be is to work signal injustice to them.

If you point to the fact that there are brilliant and capable men in the Philippines, I concede it all. I in nowise seek to impeach their character or intellectual standing. But there is no country in the civilized or semicivilized world which may not produce a few men of great and brilliant attainments, men who may in their aspirations have some poetical conceptions of free government. Mexico had her Hidalgo, her Guerrero, her Juarez, her Madero. They built their castles in the upper air and gave the highest and noblest manifestations of their sincerity, for they died and were willing to die for their faith. But they had no foundation upon which to build. That without which free institutions are but a tormenting dream, to wit, a sturdy, self-reliant people, a people of intelligence, of fixed and wholesome habits and customs they did not have. The only thing in the world out of which you can build and the only thing which will for any length of time preserve a Republic is the character and wholeness and principles of the people, the masses. Sam Adams was successful in organizing his revolt and sustaining it because he appealed to men of unusual character, of exceptional training, of signal moral courage; men who had been educated in what was in some respects the most remarkable university the world has ever seen, the New England town meeting. Washington, in the convention of 1787, said in those famous lines that perhaps no government which they could form would be accepted by the people. But it was accepted. The people were equal to the task imposed upon them. What could those leaders have done without such a constituency?

If we stay there, therefore, to serve these people, what standard shall we set up? What must we do and what must they be willing for us to do?

When shall we expect the United States Government to announce that in its judgment these people should now be free and independent? Will it be when a few intelligent and capable men have developed sufficient capacity to maintain an aristocratic form of government or will it be when the masses have been educated and schooled into self-discipline and into that knowledge of public affairs and that sustained interest in the public welfare which makes possible a republic? Will we, in order to escape the burdens of our task like an impatient guardian anxious to be rid of the ward, be satisfied with a republic in form or in name but an aristocracy in fact—a government with a few cultured and ambitious men at the top and ignorance and dependence and peonage and slavery at the bottom—or will it be when there has been sown among the people that spirit of independence, that integrity of view, that vision which alone fits them for the onerous obligations of free government? The latter obligation is the one which this country must assume if it take up the task at all. To do less is to shirk responsibility, and we had better go now. To remain longer are expense and outlay for us and no permanent benefit to the Filipinos.

You can not take those people, with the training which they have had, or the lack of training, and rear the masses of the people themselves to the standard of self-government inside of half a century or a century. If we are to discuss the question of self-government within 17 years after we first went there, and promise those people independence, or hold that view up before them at a time when they have no conception of self-government, to my way of thinking it is infinitely better to turn them loose now, and let them work out their own destiny. We may spend our time and our means and our energy for the next 15 or 20 years, and, so far as permanent results are concerned, they will be no different than if we should leave the Philippines within the next 3 or 4 years.

So I say, Mr. President, we either ought to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has submitted or we ought to eliminate, once and for all, all discussion of independence and let the Filipino people understand that the first lesson which they must learn is the lesson of self-government before they shall be permitted to assume the right of independence, and they must be permitted to know from us in plain but kindly language that they will not acquire that capacity for self-government within the next 50 or 100 years; that it is a long, tedious lesson, requiring patience and persistence beyond anything they seem to have contemplated.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this matter we can not ignore in measuring the task before us. The power of a nationality struggling ever to become a nation is one of the most weird and persistent influences in all the affairs of the human family. The turmoil in Europe for the last 100 years has been largely by reason of the fact that some nationality has been dominated or controlled by a nation of a different nationality. A nationality and a nation are two different propositions. These people are entirely different in language, in cus-

toms, in habits, in tastes, in mental capacity. They are a nationality in and of themselves, so far as comparison with the United States is concerned, and it will take many years to reconstruct that nationality, if we can ever do it at all. I think I may say that it has never been accomplished satisfactorily and never tried for any considerable length of time without great sacrifice of human life.

In 1772 three of the great powers of Europe partitioned Poland; in 1793 they made that partition complete, and were supposed to have destroyed that great nationality; but, as some writer has said, the Polish agitator has been the nerve of revolution in Europe every hour since the partition took place. There has never been a great revolution struggling for better conditions in Europe since 1772 that has not in some respects been led or aided by great Polish patriots. The kings or the absolute powers which distributed their country distributed the patriotism and the desire for nationality throughout Europe and furnished the means by which to augment, and thereby further, every revolution in Europe since that time.

It seems impossible, Mr. President, to destroy that sentiment of nationality which at all times inheres in a people, and it seems to be as strong with races of inferior capacity, if I may use the term, as with races of a more developed standard.

I want to read a few lines, Mr. President, from the great Italian statesman, Mazzini, in regard to the proposition of one nation trying to dominate, control, or educate, or direct another nation or nationality. Speaking of the smaller nationalities of Europe which have been under the control of some larger nation, Mr. Mazzini said:

They struggled, they still struggle, for country and liberty; for a word inscribed upon a banner, proclaiming to the world that they also live, think, love, and labor for the benefit of all. They speak the same language, they bear about them the impress of consanguinity, they kneel beside the same tombs, they glory in the same tradition, and they demand to associate freely, without obstacles, without foreign domination in order to elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the great pyramid of history. It is something moral which they are seeking, and this moral something is in fact, even politically speaking, the most important question in the present state of things. It is the organization of the European task. In principle, nationality ought to be to humanity that which division of labor is in a workshop—the recognized symbol of association; the assertion of the individuality of a human group called by its geographical position, its traditions, and its language to fulfill a special function in the European work of civilization.

Whether that function be small or great, inferior or superior, it seems to assert its right to existence against all the power of man to change or to redirect it; in other words, a review of the history of the world shows that there is a logic of things and a logic of events which no human agency can change or redirect, and one of them is founded upon the great desire of every nationality at some time to become a nation.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine for a moment the conception of government which obtains in the Philippines after the years which we have been there—and perhaps we have done as good a work in the Philippines as ever was accomplished by any people toward a dependent people. I read from the testimony of ex-President Taft, on page 368, at the bottom of the page. He is there discussing the presentation of the views of leading Filipinos upon the question of independence:

Well, they said, they wanted to file a brief with me; and they did so—and these were leading educated Filipinos. In that brief they went on to enumerate the number of offices that there were in the municipalities and the provinces and the central government; and then they gave statistics of the *Ilustrados*, the educated people in the island; and they proved that the *Ilustrados* were more than twice as many as the offices to be filled; and they said that with two shifts that would give a competent government, and self-government. [Laughter.] Well, I explained to them that it was not the capacity to fill offices that gave a capacity for self-government to a people, it was public opinion, and that if they did not have broad popular public opinion to control people in office, they were not fit for self-government.

Then he further says:

I took a committee of Senators and Representatives out to the Philippines when I was Secretary of War, in 1905, and Fisk Warren, an anti-imperialist from Boston, visited the islands at the same time, because he thought that with my prejudice and my bitterness of feeling I could not be relied on to show the party the real capacity of the Filipino people for government; and so he demanded, in the name of the Filipino people, that I give the Filipino people an opportunity to be heard. And after I had taken the party all around the islands and we came back to Manila I sent word to Mr. Warren that he might produce any committee that the Filipinos wished to send and present what they thought as to their own power of self-government.

And so they presented a petition August 28, 1905. I can not read it all. It says:

This, to me, Mr. President, is one of the most interesting features of this entire investigation and altogether the most instructive piece of evidence that we have. This is from their brief:

In spite of the unquestionable political capacity of the Filipino people, the result of their present degree of culture and civilization, that they are in a condition of self-government is denied in varying degrees

and forms, though precisely the contrary is demonstrated by facts, experiences, and considerations, among which the following deserve mention:

First. It is an irrefutable fact that the Filipino people are governable; the period of Spanish dominion and of the present American sovereignty bear out this assertion. The political condition of a country principally depends upon the degree of governableness of its people; the more governable the popular classes are the better the political condition of the country.

This was the view of government as presented by the most intelligent of the Filipino people, which, of course, is the old view of the Holy Alliance, which was formed at the close of the Napoleonic wars, the principal tenet of whose creed was that all power came from above and that the people were not entitled to have anything to say with reference to the divine right of government; that a governable people were a people who submitted to the dictation and direction of those who chanced to be in a governing position. It is the old doctrine of the congress of Laybach, that the power to govern comes from above, and that all effort to assert any such right upon the part of the masses should be eliminated, regardless of the method of elimination.

When a people such as the Filipinos gave signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilateness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

Second. If the masses of the people are governable, a part must necessarily be denominated the directing class, for as in the march of progress, moral or material, nations do not advance at the same rate, some going forward while others fall behind, so it is with the inhabitants of a country, as observation will prove.

Third. If the Philippine Archipelago has a popular governable mass called upon to obey and a directing class charged with the duty of governing, it is in a condition to govern itself.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country.

To wit, a governing class and a class willing to be governed—class domination, class control, class direction—and no form of government ever conceived by the human mind is quite so cruel and oppressive as class government.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country—an entity that knows how to govern, the directing class, and an entity that knows how to obey, the popular masses.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator inform me whose sentiments are those?

Mr. BORAH. Those were the sentiments of some 25 of the most highly educated Filipinos as they presented their theory of self-government to ex-President Taft.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator state the date of that document?

Mr. BORAH. Nineteen hundred and five.

Mr. LIPPITT. Some 10 or 11 years ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I presume the Senator makes that suggestion upon the theory that such an idea of government could be eliminated in a period of some 10 or 20 years.

Mr. LIPPITT. No, Mr. President; I only wanted to have the exact time, because it was only a few years after we had been in the islands, and I thought it was perhaps only just to the Filipino people that that might be stated and let everybody draw his own inference from it.

Mr. BORAH. What I am seeking to do in bringing the attention of the Senate to this conception of self-government is to emphasize the fact that it comes from a class of people who are more highly educated and better trained in the affairs of government than we would be able to educate and train the masses of the Filipinos in the next fifty or a hundred years. It is to show they have a different standard, a different understanding, and that we not only have to train them to read and write and give them poise and character as a people, but we must reform and change all standards and all conceptions of government.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. It is, in other words, Mr. President, a conflict between the old doctrine of the holy alliance and the United States Government in the Philippines, and we will have to stay there, if we do stay, until we uproot and eradicate a thing that is most difficult to uproot and eradicate, and that is the conception of government which has been drilled into the intellect and moral fiber of those people by 300 years of experience. Now I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was about to ask the Senator if he did not think that the sentiments expressed by the people whom

he has just quoted are sentiments of the class that would do the ruling and governing in the islands if the Filipino people had their independence?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; I have no doubt of that.

Mr. President, I know that there are a great many very intelligent men in the Philippines, men of great capacity—exceptionally brilliant men some of them are—and in saying anything that I do say I do not, as I have already said, seek to impeach their intelligence or the integrity of character of those men, but we are not dealing with a situation which simply requires us to teach some one how to read or how to speak the English language; we are dealing with a question which requires the unteaching of centuries of schooling. We can not, if I may repeat, ignore the tutelage or the gloomy lessons in government which those people have had for the last 300 years.

The country, as I have said, which held sway over these islands, it will be remembered, was one of those powers which joined the conspiracy at the close of the Napoleonic wars, under the sacrilegious title of the Holy Alliance, the supreme purpose of which was to crush out free government and to root out the spirit of liberty wherever it was possible to exert to that end its sinister and baleful influence. The basic principle of this merciless creed was that the people were by ordinance divine wholly unfit to have a voice in the sacred affairs of government; that all powers of government came from above; and that any manifestation of independence, any expressed purpose to be free upon the part of the governed, were to be stamped out in any conceivable way which a tireless and satanic ingenuity could devise. No member of this conspiracy was more unyielding, more successful in carrying out in all its hideous logic this cruel and fiendish theory. Wherever her inflexible decrees have had sway ignorance and oppression and social degradation have been the immutable lot of the masses. With studied and iniquitous vigilance, with an industry worthy of a noble cause, she punished with rack and thumbscrew, with torture and death, everyone who gave evidence of a longing to enjoy the initiative of sentient beings. Always exacting the last penny which an oppressed peasantry could through unremitting toil grind out, withholding every comfort whose temporary enjoyment might be calculated to reanimate some soul with the desire to be free, she succeeded at last in destroying wholly and completely the initiative, the self-respect, the self-reliance, the hopes, and ambitions of all those from whom we believe the rights of government are derived. She left the hearts and souls of the people as bare and blighted as the miserable hovels in which they lived. It is no ordinary task to unteach these lessons, to reanimate with the aspirations and confidence of a self-helping people these dependents of three long, black, rayless centuries.

It will be a difficult task, a long and arduous task, to implant in the hearts and minds of the masses that initiative, that intelligence, that self-respect and self-reliance indispensable to a self-governing people.

So, Mr. President, we must gird ourselves for this kind of a task: Either to stay there indefinitely—and I say "indefinitely" because I regard 50 or 100 years beyond a point which we ought to discuss independence at all; I regard the task before us such as precludes the discussion of independence or anything like it. We must stay there indefinitely if we are going to help the masses of the Filipino people; and I do not permit myself to be influenced by the intelligent, capable upper class in the Philippines, because they will likely be able to take care of themselves. To state it more appropriately perhaps in the task before us we must first of all consider the interests of the masses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator tell us, if he has the information, what proportion of the entire population of the Philippine Islands are of the more intelligent class?

Mr. BORAH. I can not tell the Senator exactly. I am told, however, by those who have been there that it is a very small percentage, but I do not know what it is exactly.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, there are about 68,000, as I recollect, qualified to vote under the literacy test.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many?

Mr. LIPPITT. About 68,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; there are 248,000 who were registered under the test, and 235,000 actually voted.

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; and of that 235,000 there were about 68,000, if my recollection is correct, who qualified under the literacy qualification. There were other qualifications. I will

turn to the testimony in a minute or two, but I think I am correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in an address delivered by ex-President Taft before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, in 1915, he discussed the point the Senator has been making, as to the fact that there was a governing class and a class willing to be governed, and he said:

Thus they were capable of self-government because they had a ruling class of 10 per cent and an obedient class of 90 per cent.

And he went on further to say that a prominent Filipino suggested that they ought to have a third class of Chinamen, who would not be allowed to participate in government, but who would do the work.

Mr. BORAH. In the language of the ex-President, to serve in the capacity of work animals.

Mr. GALLINGER. Work animals; yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just a word further, I quite agree with what the Senator has been saying, that in order that a people may be capable of self-government the masses of the people must understand self-government. It is not sufficient to have a governing class.

I desire to put this question to the Senator: According to the information which we now seem to have, probably not to exceed 10 per cent of the people of the Philippine Islands have sufficient training or sufficient intelligence even to undertake the effort of governing themselves. Suppose that instead of these intelligent Filipinos—who, we must all concede, even though they may be intelligent, have not the capacity of the Anglo-Saxon for self-government—10 per cent of the population were American citizens who were trained and who had inherited through centuries this ability for self-government. Even with a class of that character in these islands, does the Senator believe that it would be possible for those men, let alone the Filipinos, to govern the islands if the strength and power of the United States Government were entirely withdrawn?

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President. Even the Anglo-Saxon race has not shown very much greater capacity for proper self-government, where there were only about 10 per cent of them, than any other race. The Anglo-Saxon race has disclosed its great capacity for self-government because of the intelligence and the capacity and the character of the other 90 per cent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Precisely.

Mr. BORAH. If you had only 10 per cent of Americans in the Philippine Islands, I would not be willing to intrust them with the power of government over the other 90 per cent. The Senator will recall that only this morning in the Judiciary Committee we had an illustration of the remarkable disposition of the Anglo-Saxon race to revert to the power of tyranny and oppression when there were only about 10 per cent of them in the place, and the other 90 per cent were of some other class or of an inferior people. They ignore the Constitution and constitutional provisions, in certain places where we are now governing a large class, almost as much as our cultured friends who have been trained in that kind of class government for the last 300 years.

There is just one safeguard for a free people, and there is no other found among men or upon earth; and that is the education, the character, the intelligence, the initiative, and the poise of the man in the street. There is no class of people who are to be trusted with the power of governing some one else. Abraham Lincoln said that no man is himself free who governs some one else against his will.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a minute, to correct a statement which I made a few minutes ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIPPITT. I find, on looking at the record, at page 187, that there were about 90,000 Filipinos who qualified under the educational test. There were others who qualified under the qualification for holding office and under a property qualification.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator. Does the Senator wish to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes. I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that he does not take into consideration the fact that the qualification which is imposed on a voter there, outside of the property qualification, consists of his knowing enough to read and write the English language or the Spanish language, neither of which is his own language. Suppose, as a matter of fact, we were to impose here the requirement that no one

in this country could vote unless he were able to speak the Spanish or the French language. How many voters would we have?

It seems to me that is not a fair illustration to test how many people can read and write in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have made no statement with reference to these points. I merely made a statement as to the number of people who were qualified to vote under a property qualification. Any deductions that may be drawn from that are something entirely outside of my vision. I merely stated the fact.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement made by the Senator just before he was interrupted seems to me so apt and so true that I feel impelled to inform him that some years ago I had the honor of an interview with the late President of Mexico, Porfirio Diaz, and in response to an inquiry which he made of me concerning my impressions of the Mexican Government, I replied that it seemed to me to have been better described by Mr. Lummis as "a republic in chancery" than any other description I had ever seen. I then said that the so-called Republic of Mexico was as radically different from our own, so far as my observation went, as though it were a monarchy. His reply was that no nation can be a self-governing one which does not possess a great, intelligent, patriotic, property-holding class, and that until Mexico had such a class its government would not be that of the United States.

I simply interject that into the Record because it seems to be so apposite with the reflection of the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that is quite correct, and I am coming in a few moments to Mexico as an illustration. In taking up Mexico I will say now, in order that there may be no misgivings, that I am not going to discuss it as its history has been written for the last four or five years, but prior to that time, as an illustration of class rule.

I find here, upon page 370, that ex-President Taft says there are about 90 per cent of the people not fit for self-government, but that the 10 per cent of educated Filipinos do not understand self-government. I ought to say in passing here, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that there is nothing surprising about the fact that the Filipino educated gentleman has an entirely different conception of government than we have. He has been trained in it. He has known nothing else. He has no other view before him. He never has had. It would be a great surprise if we should find that he had any such view as we entertain.

Let me call your attention to an illustration drawn by the ex-President:

One day, while I was governor in the Philippines, a man named Felipe Calderon, one of the leading lawyers in the Philippines, the man who introduced the constitution into the convention at Malolos, came to see me—

Now, here is a constitution maker—

While he was there a poor old Tagalog, who could not speak Spanish, presented a petition to me. My Spanish would make your heart bleed to hear it, even when I was out there, and now it has gone entirely. The petition was in Spanish, and so far as I could figure it out, it contained a recital that his son had been six years in Bilbid Prison; that he had never been tried; and the old man wanted to know what I could do. He had heard that the commission had come there to help out the Filipinos, and he wanted to know if we could not help him.

Well, I turned to Calderon and said to him, "The writ of habeas corpus is in force here. If you will just present a petition for the writ in any of the courts in Manila you can get this man out, if what he says is true."

"Well," said Calderon, "what is a petition for a writ of habeas corpus?"

He had copied the Mexican Constitution and the Federal Constitution and had helped to make up the constitution of Malolos, but he did not have any practical knowledge of those processes which are the Anglo-Saxon palladium of individual right and liberty. And so I drafted for him the form of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and he took it into court and he got his man out.

That is called to your attention to direct you again to the thought that the proposition of teaching them to read and write, and of giving them an education, and of spreading that kind of intelligence among the masses is only the first step, a very short step, and may be a very ineffective step, toward self-government.

The task before the American people in the Philippines is to reconstruct the entire conception of government on the part of the intelligent, as well as to train those who are without intelligence; and no more difficult task was ever assumed by anyone. Let me ask the learned Members of this Senate, men versed in history: Will you give me an illustration, from the beginning of time until now, where that task has been achieved with any degree of permanent success? Will you tell me of an instance

in which an intelligent and educated or a self-governing people has ever trained another nationality into their style and capacity of government?

It may be that there is such an example; but I do not know of it, and I have been unable to find it. I do know that there are countless illustrations to the contrary. Therefore, I say that the task before us is not the task of a quarter of a century, nor of half a century. Indeed, sir, if we are to be fair and candid with the Filipino, we must say to him that he is with us for all time, unless we turn him loose now. So far as those now living in the Philippines are concerned, they will never secure independence if they await the completion of the full task which we assume by remaining longer.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not want to interrupt the Senator; but I should like to suggest to him that in those governments where the people have evolved their own civilization and reached a point where no one would question their capacity for maintaining a government of their own, in order to change to our form of government they have almost universally been forced to resort to revolution, and the revolutions have almost universally come from the class of people who Senators maintain upon this floor are incapable of self-government.

Mr. BORAH. All revolutions in government that had any real foundation have started from the masses.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I entirely agree with what the Senator has said; and I want to cite an instance bearing out the Senator's argument that mere forms of self-government do not constitute self-government; and that, on the contrary, without any forms at all, if the people understand the principles of self-government, they will have it. I refer to the contrast between the man the Senator has described, who drew a free constitution for the Philippine Islands and did not know what the writ of habeas corpus was, and the great, free people of Great Britain, probably as free a people as there are in the world, who have no constitution at all, so far as any written form is concerned.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. President, one more illustration upon this matter and I will pass it over.

It has been said in this debate that there is very little resemblance between the Mexican situation in previous years and that in the Philippines. I find a very strong resemblance.

The Philippines were discovered and brought under control by the same class of explorers as those who overran and conquered Mexico—the same treatment of the natives, the same method of control, the same remorseless rule ensued. I venture to say the same effect and the same deadly virus were the inheritance of both countries from the common master. Allow me to digress here long enough to say I have read a good many pages of history, some bright and some exceptionally black, but I have never read any story of frightfulness anywhere equal to the dismal, monotonous, ruthless, unbroken, and unending story of oppression and injustice in Mexico. In duration and in demoniacal heartlessness, in unvarying fiendishness it has no parallel, so far as I know. Compared with it the cruelties inflicted upon Cuba which called into action the humanitarian spirit of a whole Nation were mild and fleeting. And so far as bringing any relief was concerned, the people of Mexico gained nothing by her independence. It left the same class of rulers—men with the same conception of the rights of the masses, the same venal appetites. It is a pathetic tale, the scene of which lies so close to our door, this effort, this long, futile struggle of the masses to be free, to realize that ever-haunting, half-waking dream of ownership of their lands and their homes; a dream always interrupted at a propitious moment under Empire or Republic alike by that debonair and devilish clique of conspirators, the sole inheritors of Mexico from the mother country.

It is now over a hundred years since the statesman-priest, Miguel Hidalgo, called about him the oppressed, the peons and the slaves, and declared war on their oppressors. From that hour to this the fight has gone on, and in my humble judgment they are no nearer realizing anything like a free or tolerable government to-day than they were 100 years ago. The ruling class as elsewhere at all times talk glibly of free government and practice the most pronounced oppression; profess great con-

cern for the poor yet with unabated vigilance restrain them to the dead level of hopeless serfdom. These rulers have succeeded in their nefarious schemes from year to year and from decade to decade because they have been successful in denying to the masses all opportunity or chance of advancement, in deluding them from time to time with the promise of free homes and free government, but always denying the one and for the other giving them a most cruel, exacting, venal, blood-sucking aristocracy.

In 1856 in Mexico under Juarez—about the one real sympathizing patriot, so far as the masses were concerned, that Mexico ever produced—they wrote a remarkable constitution. I have it upon my desk and had intended to read from it, but I have not the time. It is a remarkable instrument. It divides the government into three parts—the legislative, the executive, and the administrative—and then they wrote a remarkable charter of principles. It was written by Juarez and his supporters, by those who constituted the masses or the governed class. As soon as it was put into effect, and as soon as it began to prevail in Mexico, the governing class conspired to destroy it, and the war between them has been going on from that time until now. Leaders like Juarez could not rely upon the masses. Yet many were able to read. Many were able to write. They could make constitutions. They were of exceptional intelligence for people who had been raised as they were. But the capacity for self-government was utterly a thing apart from the masses of the Mexican people. The result has been that you have had class war in Mexico from that hour until now; and, in my judgment, you will have the same question in the Philippines until those people are not only—if I could use the term properly—reconstructed but rehabilitated in their entire conception of self-government. Will some man tell me within what number of years we could do that?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. LANE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said, and I have noticed that he bases his argument that the Filipinos will be unable to govern themselves upon the assumption that for the past 300 years they have been saturated with examples of government set them by the Spanish. As a matter of fact, as I have read the history of the Philippine Islands, the Filipino people for 300 years were in revolt against the Spanish rule, and have never accepted it at any time, and never at any time within the 300 years of occupancy of that country by the Spanish people did the Spanish Governor General or any of his suite or any of his functionaries dare go outside of a walled city without danger of losing their lives. The Spanish influence never went beyond the reach of their cannon. The people of the interior of the country were in revolt against them for 300 years continually and constantly, and no Spanish Governor General in 300 years had his scalp safe on his head unless he stayed within or hugged close to a walled city. From within walled cities they tried to rule them, but the rule did not extend far outside of the wall. They did not become accustomed to or receive any inspiration from the Spanish rule. They fought it all down the line for all that time. They are amply prepared, if resistance and repugnance to that kind of a government prepare them, for freedom. They were held in check by the military power of Spain, but never admired or consented to the methods of conducting a government as it was conducted by that country. The lone 10 per cent to whom the distinguished Senator now refers were the people who lived inside of the walled cities, and not those who were free and out in the open country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, because it entirely accentuates the view which I take of this situation. There is a way of saturating a man which is different from applying hot cloths. But this statement that was filed with the ex-President by the learned Filipinos said, as one of the arguments in favor of free government:

When a people such as the Filipinos give signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilativeness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

I do not think there is any difference between the Senator and myself as to final results.

Now, let us view this preamble just a moment, for I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] as a substitute for the preamble and a substitute for the bill, because that is the effect of it. It is a substitute. It is

offered as an amendment, but the effect of it is to constitute it a substitute.

The preamble says:

Whereas it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines such an increasing control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the sovereignty of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence, which it is the purpose of the United States to grant when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands.

No impartial tribunal is erected to pass upon that question; but the United States, when in its judgment it shall deem it to the permanent interest of the Filipino people to have independence, is going to grant that independence. To hold a people in subjection when you say to them, "You are practically prepared for independence," when as a matter of fact they are not practically prepared for independence and will not be for long years to come, is, in my judgment, to create disturbance, to breed revolution, to create discontent and dissatisfaction. It is to invite trouble. It is to make real progress in their interest most difficult, if not impossible.

If this bill passes with the preamble in it, within 90 days or six months those people will begin to feel that the time is ripening for their independence; that you could not have been talking about an independence in the far-off years; that it must be something that is practically now within their reach, and that they are practically fitted for it. The effect of the preamble would be to breed discontent among the people of the Philippines if you do not give them their independence within a very reasonable time.

If I am correct in my position that if we stay there for 5 years or 10 years or 15 years or 20 years and then give them their independence they will as a permanent proposition be no better fitted for self-government than they are now, we are going to have all kinds of trouble and difficulty within a very short time by reason of this preamble. They will construe it from their standpoint, and they will insist that they are entitled to have it construed from their standpoint and from what they believe to be their capacity for self-government.

I think it was Mr. Burke, the great English orator and philosopher, who said, in his speech on reconciliation with America, that—

Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion and ever will be so long as the world endures. Plain, good intentions—

The orator continues—

as easily discovered at first as fraud is sure to be detected at last, is, let me say, no mean force in the government of mankind. A genuine simplicity of heart is a healing and cementing principle.

This is the substance, if not his exact words.

I think of all things in legislation the most important is language which is not susceptible of misconstruction or misunderstanding. It ought to be plain, simple, direct, and positive. We ought not, in my judgment, even to discuss the question of independence with these people at this time if we are going to retain them until indeed they are fit for self-government.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other reason why I am inclined to support this amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In line with the statement the Senator has just made that they would not be fitted for self-government for decades and decades, does he not think that that would lead to insurrection and to revolts among the Filipino people?

Mr. BORAH. Well, if it did, then we are up against this proposition of postponing that insurrection for a day only, because I can not conceive of the United States remaining in the Philippines for any purpose any longer except to educate the Filipino people in self-government. I do not see any other business we have there; I can not see any other reason for our remaining; and it is utterly untenable to my mind to assume that we can do that task or perform that duty inside of decades.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from Idaho to make any declaration on the subject at all.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has stated his own view but it is no part of his purpose to insert in this measure such a declaration.

Mr. BORAH. Not at all.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this question which is in one sense a peculiar one, and still it can not be ignored in this debate. For 17 years one of the great political parties of this country has assumed the position that the Filipino people ought to have their independence. That party is now in power in all the departments of Government. So far as the pledge of an opposite party is concerned it might not

greatly concern me as a citizen of the United States and a member of another party, but we must deal with such questions from a little different viewpoint and at a different range, as it were intellectually, when we come to interpret those pledges in the light of what a dependent people expect and what they have a right to expect now. This campaign has been going on in this country, as I said, for nearly 20 years. In 1900, in 1904, and so on the great party now in power pledged itself to the giving of these people independence when they should come into power. There was no misunderstanding as to the meaning of that pledge in the campaigns. We may refine upon it here in the Senate Chamber, but the people of the United States understood it, and if the people of the United States understood it you may be assured that the Filipino people interpreted it even more strongly in favor of independence.

I will take a moment to recall those pledges, because they do not admit, in my judgment, of misconstruction, and are not to be ignored in the full and fair discharge of our duty:

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration—

This was in 1908—

of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

It has been said here that that did not necessarily mean that the Filipino people were capable of self-government; that it might take some time. I refer to a speech by Mr. Bryan, made many years ago—and certainly the Filipinos are no less fit for self-government now than they were then—in which he said:

We are told that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government. That has a familiar ring. Only two years ago I heard the same argument made against a very respectable minority of the people of this country. * * * Self-government is a constant education; the capacity for self-government increases with participation in government. The Filipinos are not far enough advanced to share in the government of the people of the United States, but they are competent to govern themselves.

* * * * *

Give the Filipinos time and opportunity, and while they never will catch up with us, unless we cease to improve, yet they may some day stand where we stand now—

And so forth.

I could quote to any extent from similar sentiments made by not only the distinguished leader of the party at that time, and possessing some influence in his party still, I suspect, but other distinguished leaders of the party, to the effect that the declaration in the platform meant precisely what it said—that the Filipino people were fit for self-government and were entitled to complete independence. Now, that pledge has been in existence upon the part of this party for the last 17 or 20 years.

As I said, that party is now in power. For one, I am not going to stand in the way of a fulfillment of that pledge because it does not relate to me, as some of the platform pledges might as a citizen of the United States, but it is a pledge by this Government, as it is now controlled, to a dependent people.

Mr. Moorfield Storey, in interpreting this platform, said a few days ago:

Upon these statements of policy and these promises the Democratic Party has sought the support of the voters, and it has now received that support and is in full control of the Government. If words mean anything, it has promised to give the Filipinos their independence, and no man can trust it if this promise is broken. Why should any Democrat suggest that the policy which his party has so uniformly and so repeatedly pledged itself to adopt be now abandoned and the Republican policy which it has "condemned and denounced," which it has characterized as "an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary, and vague absolutism," which it has called "an inexcusable blunder," be now adopted or by delay continued in operation?

That is a construction placed on the platform by one of the most intelligent and one of the ablest Democrats in the country. Now, what interpretation naturally have the Filipino people placed upon it, and if it is not carried out—if that pledge is not fulfilled—in what condition of mind does it leave the Filipino people in the Philippines?

In my judgment, Mr. President, we can not ignore those pledges as we might as Republicans if they were dealing with matters which related solely and wholly to our own country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho think that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is a redemption of this pledge, which, as I understand him, is that the Filipinos shall be given immediate independence?

I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas pro-

poses to give the Filipinos independence, perhaps, because it has a proviso which reads:

That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines.

So this extends independence with a string to it, which may be pulled back.

Mr. BORAH. It also provides that it shall go into effect unless Congress affirmatively rescinds or repeals this act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which Congress may very well do.

Mr. BORAH. Congress may very well do it, Mr. President. I am aware that it is an easy thing to pass resolutions in a political convention. I am also aware that to withdraw sovereignty where it has once obtained or to take the flag out of the sky with which it has become familiar is about the most difficult and tantalizing task that a people can undertake to perform. It is a very difficult thing to withdraw sovereignty.

I have no doubt that the Senator from Arkansas in offering this amendment had to accommodate himself to a situation and that there were those who were not willing to let the Filipinos go to-morrow or the next day, and, indeed, I presume, too, that it would be unwise, until the transfer of government could be made complete and efficient and effective, to do so; but it is a decided step, and in brief will be a conclusive step.

There is one thing that will be certain, and I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me. If that is passed, in at least five years from now those people will be free.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that would follow at all.

Mr. BORAH. I think it does, for this reason: I have no fear in the world of Congress ever repealing this law if we start upon the proposition of independence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The proviso that I have already read provides that the President may extend the time if, in his judgment, it appears that the conditions as to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government are such as to justify him in doing it. Of course if the conditions in that respect are such as to justify the President in extending the time, the language of the proviso, it seems to me, very clearly indicates that they will be sufficient to justify Congress in making some other disposition; and Congress may indefinitely extend the time or repeal the law altogether. It is not a hard and fast piece of legislation.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I said, it is independence with a string to it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the date fixed in an act were absolute, four or five years from now, there would be a right in Congress to repeal the act. You can not make a legislative act which can not be repealed. Considering the exigencies that might arise, considering that we might be in a state of war at the time, it seems to me it would be very appropriate for the President to have the power to extend the time for a year, or even to extend it longer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me, let me ask the Senator from Colorado, if the effect of the legislation is the same whether it contains this proviso or not, why put in the proviso?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; it is not the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is not the same; but I believe, and I think the Senator believes, if this is passed, as the Senator from Idaho has said, it will end our jurisdiction over there within five years, not that Congress could not vote under that proviso to extend the time—it could extend the time under any statement that might be made—but a pledge made by Congress is not likely ever to be violated by either a subsequent Congress or by the people of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What the Senator from Colorado says is true—that if the proviso was not here at all Congress would still have the power to repeal the legislation. There is not any doubt about that. But the difference would be that in the one case there would be a positive, absolute piece of legislation the terms of which Congress would have to violate if it repealed the law, whereas with the proviso in there is not any violation of the terms, because Congress will have reserved the right. It is precisely the thing we do very often in legislation which affects the rights of private individuals. We grant a right to construct a bridge, or something of that sort, and we give the grantee warning by putting in the legislation a pro-

vision that this law may be repealed or altered or amended by Congress at any time. We warn him in advance what we may do. It is not because it adds to the power of Congress, but we put it in as an express admonition that we are reserving our right to do that, instead of giving the understanding that the law is unalterable and irrevocable.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If Congress should pass a law at this session giving the Filipinos their independence in four years, a subsequent Congress could repeal that. There is another point to which I wish to call the Senator's attention. If this amendment is ever written upon the statute books it goes to the people of America for their approval or disapproval, and no political party in power, in my judgment, will come back here four years hence instructed to undo the work.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who seems to think the bill provides some method of extending the four-year term, if he has read the language in the bill which provides that in not more than four years independence shall be granted to the Philippine Islands. If that four years began on the 1st day of February, at 12 o'clock, it would compel the President of the United States four years from the 1st day of next February, at 12 o'clock, or at some time prior to that date to grant independence.

The bill then goes on to say that at the expiration of the period of four years—that is, at 12 o'clock four years from the 1st day of next February—after their independence has been granted under the terms of the bill, the President may consult Congress as to whether or not he shall continue the administration in the islands.

I will confess that under the conditions described in the language of the bill I am unable to see how it could be fulfilled. The bill provides that independence shall be granted before the time at which the President is allowed to consider whether or not it ought to be granted. The Senator from Idaho may want to vote for that provision.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think the view of the Senator is a correct view.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would be glad to have the Senator from Utah explain that provision if he is able.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the great anxiety of the Senator from Rhode Island to have the views of the Senator from Utah, but really I would like to conclude and then let them enlighten one another later.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. COLT. I should like to ask the Senator how he reconciles his position of granting independence to the Filipinos with the other position which he has elucidated so ably that the people are not capable at the present time of establishing a stable form of government. If the people are not able at the present time to establish a stable form of government, does not the Government of the United States owe to them a duty which it does not fulfill by granting them independence now and thus setting them adrift before they are capable of maintaining any form of stable government?

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator a question in order to enable me to answer him more intelligently. How long does the Senator think, in view of the speech which he made this afternoon, it will take us to educate those people for self-government?

Mr. COLT. I have no idea how long it will take; and if the Senator presses me further upon that question I would say that I think we are bound to continue the same policy with the Filipino people which we have continued for 15 years, and that I would so treat the Filipino people in the future that at the time they might demand their independence they would then feel under such obligation to us that they would not desire their independence any more than Canada desires its independence from Great Britain to-day.

I can not forecast the future, but I do feel that we have a sacred duty to fulfill to these people who have been under our charge for more than 15 years, and to my mind it would be unbecoming this great Government now to set them adrift. Let us be consistent and not hesitate to fulfill the high duty and responsibility which has fallen upon us as a great power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is very difficult to secure from even so eminent a jurist and so profound a student of his-

tory as the Senator from Rhode Island any suggestion at all as to how long it would take us to perform the task which he says it is our duty to perform.

I would agree with the Senator that there has arisen a certain moral obligation upon the part of this Government toward the Filipino people, but I am just as thoroughly convinced of the proposition as I would be of any other that could be possibly presented to my mind, that we are not going to remain in the Philippines long enough to teach them the capacity or the art of self-government, and that when you vote down the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas you vote to retain permanently the Philippine Islands.

So there are two questions here—first, whether you are going to retain the Philippine Islands permanently or, second, whether you are going to release them within a reasonable time, within such time as they can take into their hands the reins of government and assume jurisdiction over the islands.

Mr. COLT. May I ask the Senator whether we should take any action at this particular time? Why make any such declaration as is set forth in the Clarke amendment? Why not pass the bill which the committee has reported and let the matter rest there for the present?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have been seeking to explain during the afternoon why I think it is unwise to pass the bill as it is, because it promises independence, when at the same time we know that not within this generation or the succeeding generation will they be fit for self-government. I think that is eminently unwise legislation, but I think it foreshadows beyond a question what ultimately we are going to do, and that is to turn the Filipino people over to themselves or to their form of government within a time in which they will not be any better fitted for self-government than they are now.

Originally, Mr. President, I viewed this situation just as the former Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Hoar, and others did, that we ought not to have gone into the Philippine Islands at all. After we had gone into the islands and assumed certain obligations I became convinced that a moral obligation had arisen and we owed the Filipino people some duty, and we ought to perform that duty.

I have since become convinced, however, just as certainly, that under the political situation as it prevails from time to time in the United States this is going to be a political question until it is settled, and so long as it is a political question we will never teach the people of the Philippines that capacity for self-government which will enable them to deal with the question as we deal with self-government. It will be a political question in the United States, and party prejudices will be constantly changing policies in the Philippines.

I will call your attention to one who has studied this question as profoundly as any man in the United States, and who was originally as much in earnest with reference to holding the Philippines as any other man in the United States, who has defended the United States in its action upon the Philippines as effectively as any other man, and that is ex-Senator Root, where he says:

If things are to be done in that way—

That is, if the Philippine question is always to be a political question—and it always will be a political question—we had better give the islands their independence promptly: not promise it in the future, but give notice of an election and turn it over as we did with Cuba.

Undoubtedly the former Senator from New York has come to the conclusion that we are going to get out of the Philippine Islands before we shall have fully done that which he thought ought to have been achieved before we left the islands. He feels that under the conditions which are to prevail by reason of playing politics we ought to leave now.

That position, Mr. President, is the position which I assume in regard to the Clarke amendment. I am quite aware that it does not turn it over, as Senator Root says in his letter, but it takes the step which, in my judgment, will likely never be retraced.

In conclusion, it is my purpose to vote for the Clarke amendment, which, as I have stated, is in effect a substitute for the bill. I do so because, in the first place, I entertain no doubt that it is a wiser course than that outlined in the bill proper, carrying, as it does, this preamble.

I do so for the further reason that this Philippine question has been for 20 years a political question, more so now in a practical way than ever before. It seems clear that it is always to be a football of party politics, that a dependent people are to be tossed about by the vicissitudes of party interest. That being true, it is utterly impossible to perform adequately the great task before us in the Philippines. We are doing what we are

doing at a tremendous risk, and as failure under these conditions seems certain I prefer to withdraw our sovereignty now.

There are other and controlling reasons which I have indicated in my remarks, but which I will not recapitulate. If we could have gone on as we started, keeping strictly to the task of teaching these people the art of free government and the principles of a higher civilization, withholding all promise of independence until we should approach something near the time of its fruition I would have been willing to remain longer. Indeed, if I thought we would stay until in a true sense this experiment had been fully tested I would have been willing to stay. But this bill and the sentiment behind it leads me inevitably to the policy outlined by the Clarke amendment. Of the two policies I think it preferable.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator, not controversial at all but to get his opinion. Why should the pending question dealing with the disposition of the Philippine Islands be a political or a party question? What is there about it that it should take on that attitude?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, theoretically, the Senator's inferences are quite correctly taken. It should not be a political question. But the Senator, of course, knows quite as well as I know that it is a political question, both here and in the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Then does the Senator mean that one of the great political parties will favor the granting of independence to the Philippines in some form and that another one of the great political parties will oppose it?

Mr. BORAH. That has been the exact situation, I believe, for the last 17 years—the Republicans believing that the time was not yet at hand to promise independence.

Mr. STONE. Really I did not know that it had been a political or party question. To my thinking it ought to be so far removed from the field of party politics that I have not discovered that it was really a party question. I feel that Senators on a question of this kind ought to vote their opinion as to what is best for the country without any reference to party questions. If I am mistaken about it, and one party favors independence and the other is opposed to it, then am I to understand that the Democratic Party favors granting independence; and if it does that, the Republican Party is opposed to granting independence to the Filipino people?

I wanted to get near to an exact issue if possible, if there be such an issue, which I hoped there was not, and I have been inclined to believe that there was not.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Missouri looks entirely serious. There is an outward calm that is interesting.

Mr. STONE. And I am serious.

Mr. BORAH. But one of the most vital political questions that we have had in this country during one campaign, and incidentally important in all other campaigns, is the attitude of the two parties with reference to the Philippines. The Democratic Party pledged itself to independence.

Mr. STONE. That was 15 years ago.

Mr. BORAH. And ever since. You repeated it in the last platform. You say in the Democratic platform that you reassert and reavow all the things which you have said for the last 15 years with reference to the Philippines, and that you are in favor of carrying out the program, as you term it, and that, if put in power, you will do so. Here is the platform—

Mr. STONE. I am familiar with the platform. I know the attitude of the Democratic Party on the subject; but what is the attitude of the Republican Party?

Mr. BORAH. The attitude of the Republican Party was that we ought to stay in the Philippines until we enabled the Filipinos to exercise the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. And the Senator from Idaho thinks that that may be 300 or 400 years.

Mr. BORAH. I am not at all averse to saying, Mr. President, I am not ashamed to say in the presence of this distinguished body, and I am not afraid to say in the face of history, that the Filipino people will not be fitted for self-government, upon any standard which has ever prevailed in a free government, inside of 200 years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Wait just a moment. The Senator from Missouri is a historian; he challenged me upon that point the other day; and I now ask him to point me to a single instance where a people have ever acquired the art or capacity for self-government inside of 500 years?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I understand I was recognized a few moments ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado was recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no desire to take the floor if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has not yielded.

Mr. BORAH. I am going to yield now.

Mr. STONE. I undertook to interrupt the Senator from Idaho for a moment.

Mr. BORAH. I had intended to sit down, but the Senator from Missouri wanted to be enlightened as to the Democratic platform.

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to ascertain my status on the floor.

Mr. STONE. I particularly wish to be enlightened as to the Republican attitude. You can never tell anything about a Republican platform; that goes as a matter of course. The Senator from Idaho asked me—

Mr. BORAH. Now, let us not discuss party platforms this afternoon, because that is an engaging subject.

Mr. STONE. Yes; and I will not do so, although the Senator from Idaho has provoked it.

There is a modern instance—a very recent instance—where I think the people concerned were no better qualified than are the Filipinos for self-government. I refer to Cuba.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, permit me merely to say that if you withdraw the protectorate of the United States from Cuba and take the lid off in Cuba you will see what kind of a self-government they have got there at this hour.

Mr. STONE. We have not any pretense of self-government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, of course, an infant may walk so long as somebody holds him up, but—I do not say this disrespectfully—it is wholly misleading to assume for a moment that the Cuban people are trained now in the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that there is, of course, no pretense of an independent self-government, or anything approximating it, in the Philippine Islands at this time. We are governing the Philippines; we make the laws for them; we supply them with American officials, and all that. So far as the Cuban people are concerned, it may be that the Senator's conjectures as to what might happen in certain contingencies might prove true.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. Very well. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Colorado had the floor. I rose to make an inquiry of the Senator from Idaho before he took his seat, and he yielded to me before he did take his seat, but since the Senator from Colorado resents it—

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly good-natured about it. I simply was tired of "watchfully waiting." [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair has anything to do with it, he will now recognize the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] asked the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] what the Republican platform says on this question. I happened to have the platform in my hand, and thought it would be appropriate to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party as in issue with the platform of the Democratic Party on that question in 1900. The Senator says he did not understand this was a party question, and yet in 1900 it was really the paramount issue of the campaign. I asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to corroborate my recollection of that the other day, and I think he agreed with me that Mr. Bryan, as the candidate of the Democratic Party, made that what he called "the paramount issue."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that I said that Mr. Bryan tried to make that question the paramount issue, but that the newspapers of New York would not let it be done, because they wanted the financial interests to become the paramount issue. I have no doubt they carried the eastern part of the country on the financial plank in the platform.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, Mr. Bryan, as the nominee of his party, did the best he could to make it the paramount issue, and consequently it was the issue. The Republican platform of 1900 said:

In accepting by the treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish War, the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain to provide for the maintenance of law and order and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations.

Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the Government to maintain its authority to put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples.

The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Washington takes his seat, I wish to ask him a question. It seems that for the enlightenment of the American people the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to be filled up with platform promises on this question. I want to ask the Senator if the Bull Moose Party has not very recently spoken on the question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand that he has, and that he has declared in favor of getting out of the Philippines.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The platform of the Progressive Party contained no such declaration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not publish—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that some little decent respect shall be shown to the Chair. The Chair recognized the Senator from Colorado. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply want to ask the Senator from Idaho a question, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, of course, but I hope the Senator's question will not open up another long debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I simply desire to ask the Senator from Idaho, in connection with his quotation from Mr. Root, if he will not have published the entire letter of which the quotation was a part, so that it can be made plain just what Mr. Root's position is on that question?

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection to have published in my speech anything that Mr. Root may say upon any subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] upon the pending bill, whose every utterance meets my hearty approval. I do not think it is possible for one people to educate another people to its standard of efficiency either in self-government or in any other sort of government. They may, of course, transmit many of their experiences and they may make a profound impression upon the governmental theories of the subject people; but the spirit of nationality, to which the Senator from Idaho so eloquently referred, is one which embraces, and which I think is inseparable from, those ideas of government which are peculiar to it and which have been evolved either through stages of barbarism or civilization, or both, into the standard which appeals to it, and which is also best and most adaptable to its needs.

I do not believe that if the United States retained the Philippine Islands forever for the sole purpose of educating the Filipinos into the capacity for self-government—and we do not pretend to retain them for any other—that such purpose would be accomplished; that is, from the standpoint of Anglo-Saxon ideals of self-government; nor do I believe that it could do so in any given time or indefinitely, nor that any duty has devolved upon us to do it, or that we should do it at all.

If I understand the attitude of some of the opponents of this measure, of which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT] is a distinguished exponent, it is that out of our occupation and possession of the Philippine Islands has been evolved a duty—a solemn, unavoidable duty—resting upon the shoulders of the American people requiring them to transmit, before their protectorate shall be ended, no matter how long it may take, to the people of the Philippine Islands its own institutions, its own ideas of government, its own bases of society, its own methods of civilization; then it should turn them adrift, because they will then be perfectly able to take care of themselves.

Mr. President, I know of no recorded instance in history where anything of that kind ever took place, and I am confident that nothing of the kind ever did or ever will take place. The Senator, perfectly candid, as he always is, when face to face with the results of his doctrine, not only virtually concedes that that period of time will never come, but asserts that we should continue the policy in the hope that it would so far educate them as to destroy their sense or desire of self-government and make them so content with their lot that, like Canada, they will prefer their subjection to their independ-

ence; from which I infer that the Senator, recognizing the impossibility of the performance of the duty whose existence he asserts would continue the attempt to perform it until its purpose was visibly impossible of accomplishment, not only to the teacher but to the taught. By that time the old process of benevolent assimilation would have become effective, and the Filipinos, solely dependent upon us, would have lost their desire for liberty in their enjoyment of our mild and elevating overlordship.

Mr. President, I think that there is a duty which we owed to the Philippines when the Spanish War was ended; I think we still owe it to them; and I regret very much that we did not recognize and perform it away back in 1899 and 1900, as we should have done. It was pictured on this floor by the great Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar, in one of the greatest orations that ever fell from human lips, filled with warnings not only as to the effect of our proposed policy on the Filipinos but upon our own institutions. The same note of warning was sounded at the other end of this building by the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Reed. A former Senator from Vermont, still living I believe, used his pen in vigorous protest against what seemed to be to him a threatened violation of American principles, and a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. John G. Carlisle, in one of the most statesmanlike articles ever written, published, I think, in Harper's Monthly of September, 1899, pointed to the inevitable fact that we were about to embark upon a policy which would surely transform our traditional policy, violate the underlying principle of our institutions, and enter upon a career of colonization with the avowed object of what was then popularly known as "benevolent assimilation," whose results no man could foresee beyond the certainty of national misfortune. But the Nation was deaf to these appeals. We did not regard our duty then, Mr. President; we waved it aside and bought the Filipinos for \$2 apiece, paying \$20,000,000 for them and for their islands; we took forcible possession of them at once and have held them ever since, under the protest of a great portion of the American people and under a sort of common consent that at some time in the remote future we would withdraw from them and let them work out their own destiny.

I do not believe there is much difference between any of those who have considered the subject, whatever their political affiliations may be, about the general proposition that we should not remain indefinitely in the islands.

The difference is between those who would fix a definite time for leaving them and those who contend that it is impossible to fix a time because of the difficulty of performing the task which our duty has placed upon us within any specific period. That is ostensibly the difference; the real difference is, Mr. President, that some of us think we should get out of the islands as soon as we can, while others do not propose to get out of there at all, since they can very easily assign an indefinite time for final action, to be measured by our opinion of the capacity of the people for self-government, and then, as we are the judges as to when that time arrives, we can and will postpone it forever. We will thus remain in the Orient, albeit we protest that we have neither the desire nor the intention of doing so.

Mr. President, the real duty imposed upon the American people by our occupation of the islands is to me an obvious one. It has not been accomplished. It was evolved from the act of our occupation, and has continued and will continue until we perform it. That duty is to leave the islands as soon as we can do so decently, as soon as we can do so safely, as soon as we can do so with due regard to an avoidance of those disturbances which are inseparable from putting the change into effectual operation.

Mr. President, if there is a doctrine which may be said to contain a national policy for America it is what is popularly known as the Monroe doctrine, announced nearly a century ago, since which time it has received the unanimous and sometimes the overenthusiastic support of all the American people. It is familiar to all, and therefore not necessary that I should repeat it; I recall, however, that when the proposition was submitted to Mr. Jefferson he wrote Mr. Madison giving it his unqualified adherence, yet emphasized the corollary of the proposition; that America should avoid all entangling alliances abroad, keep her hands off the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere, refrain from participation in European affairs, and confine her political activities to the western world; in other words, the doctrine involved mutuality of conduct and consistency of action whereby, as a consideration of our insistence upon its observance, we should restrict ourselves to our own and the affairs of our own hemisphere. But when the Philippines were taken over, Mr. President, we established an outpost 10,000 miles from

our mainland, away off in the Orient, and by that act struck our own great Monroe doctrine a blow in the face. We repudiated our own policy, placed ourselves in direct antagonism with its principle, and gave the nations of Europe warrant for believing that our hunger for land had overcome our previous declaration of a doctrine whose adoption was essential to our freedom and with what seemed to be our manifest destiny.

It must never be forgotten that we owe duties, Mr. President, to ourselves quite as strong, and to my mind far stronger and more insistent, than any which have been imposed upon us with regard to the Philippines by reason of the relations which we voluntarily assumed and have occupied toward that country during the past 15 or 16 years. One of them, and perhaps the most important, is to so conduct our relations with other countries and other lands as to make our national policy of "hands off the American Continent" effective at all times.

What is one of the results, or one of the apparent results, of this policy of annexation? The so-called Clarke amendment provides—and, indeed, I think, it may be essential—that when the Philippine Islands are turned over to their own people, we shall seek to effectuate by treaty arrangement with other governments such provisions for their safety, their autonomy, and their neutralization as may be essential to their welfare; in other words, the duty which we have assumed, the obligation which we have imposed upon ourselves is not so much the attempt to educate the people of the Philippines to the impossible, as it is to make arrangements, possibly entangling alliances with other nations, for the betterment and welfare of a people with whom we should never have had any relations whatever. Where these treaties may lead us no man knoweth. But we do know that they are the outgrowth of our disregard of a national policy, whose overshadowing importance to ourselves has been the theme of every statesman and diplomatist since 1823. Yes; we must make alliances forsooth with other nations for the protection of an Asiatic people with whom we have nothing in common, whom we secured at the behest of commercialism rather than from any concern for their so-called civilization.

Mr. President, we hear a good deal in these exciting times about the need of preparation for national defense. The imagination of many good men and women easily pictures the menace of foreign invasion; the air and the sea and the land seem to them to be peopled with specters of danger ever approaching from every side, the more apprehensive because they are unreal and indefinite, yet many of those who really entertain the view that our alleged defenseless condition makes us a tempting victim to any of the great powers of the world are among those who would keep the Philippines indefinitely, either as a subject Province or as an outlying colony, which may become fitted through the exigencies of industry and of politics for admission to statehood. They insist upon keeping a land thousands of miles away from our coast, which is unprotected and undefended, and which therefore offers to any nation which may design to enter into a conflict with the American people the most tempting opportunity to begin hostilities, where it would be practically impossible for us to promptly meet and overcome it. Of course, an attack of that sort, Mr. President, arousing the national indignation and appealing to the national pride, would inevitably plunge us into a war, which perhaps never would have arisen but for the opportunity given to bring it on through the existence of these conditions which this bill, I think, would put an end to. In other words, Mr. President, the Philippines are a source of national danger. I think that the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] a few moments ago of the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt concerning the problem is correct, if I have been properly informed as to what he has recently said about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not fully informed as to the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt on the question. That, however, was not the question that was asked me by the Senator from Mississippi. He asked me as to the declaration of the Progressive Party platform on the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to ask the Senator from Washington if the great leader of the late so-called Bull Moose Party had not recently announced himself in favor of an abandonment of the Philippine Islands. I may have been mistaken.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; the question—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I heard the Senator from Mississippi distinctly. On the contrary, he asked me if the platform of that party had not so declared, and I informed him that it had not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I asked the Senator, in a facetious spirit, if the Bull Moose Party had not recently declared in favor of releasing the Philippine Islands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They have not. That was the question, as I understood it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then I said to the Senator that I understood that "he" had. [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not catch the latter remark. I merely want to say that the attitude of Mr. Roosevelt was discussed here the other day, and a quotation from some of his utterances was made to show that he had been in favor of declaring to the Filipinos that we would give them their independence as soon as they were capable of self-government, but that construction of his utterance was disputed here, and I do not think that it was susceptible of that construction myself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not care, of course, to raise the question whether or not my information was correct. I think, however, that the opinion of the late leader of the Bull Moose Party is much more important than the expression of the opinion of that party, which is now but a passing memory.

My understanding, however, is that the very point which I was just seeking to emphasize had impressed itself upon Col. Roosevelt, within the last four or five months at least, so strongly and so powerfully that, recognizing the danger involved in our exposed position away out across the seas, he suggested that it would be well to get rid of them, and get rid of them as soon as possible, especially, Mr. President, in view of the fact, as was well said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that the party now in power, having constantly promised to do this thing, could accomplish the purpose. Of course I do not pretend to quote the utterances of the ex-President.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to give the exact quotation.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was in Everybody's Magazine of January, 1915, in which Col. Roosevelt said:

If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines from a military standpoint are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go, and by its actions has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any guaranty whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, for once I am in perfect accord with the ex-President of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I want for a moment to refer to the argument which is based upon the proposition that we should hold the Philippines until they are capable of self-government, which means, of course, that we must hold them until we think they have been educated up to our standard of political efficiency.

I contend that no nation has any right, that no nation can lawfully and justly acquire any right, to pass judgment upon the capacity of any other nation for self-government. It is none of our business whether the people of the Philippines are capacitated for self-government or not; and if we assume to judge, that judgment when tested by experience may prove to be worthless and erroneous.

Moreover, I deny that one people has the power to confer freedom and independence upon another, except by removing them from every constraint of overlordism. That is not the way in which freedom has been acquired by any people at any time in the history of mankind. Freedom, liberty, self-governing institutions have been won by the peoples who have enjoyed them by their struggles, their sufferings, and their sacrifices. One of the greatest Senators—Mr. Toombs, of Georgia—who ever occupied a seat in this body said, more than half a century ago:

Liberty and freedom are the virtues of those who have acquired and fought for them without ceasing, and no nation can long retain them which is not at all times ready to die for them.

That is the test. If we are to keep these people in leading strings, the very fact will deprive them of that resourcefulness, that self-reliance, that experience which comes from hard knocks in government as well as in life, which is not only the test of character, but which develops it both individually and as a nation. The longer we hold these people, the longer one people hold any other in leading strings—provided, of course, their control is effective—the more remote is the possibility of self-government being developed among them.

And I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not much concerned whether the Filipinos, when they are given their freedom, as we call it, can or will govern themselves or not. I think we should be much more concerned in the reflex action and influence of our attitude concerning the Philippines upon our own institutions and upon the national character than we are in trying

to educate them up to our own standards of self-government and then setting them adrift when we conclude that our task has been accomplished. They will ultimately have that government which comes from the evolution of tests and experience among themselves, and that will be the one to which they are entitled and for which they are adapted.

For my part, I do not care whether that ultimate government is a republic, a monarchy, or some other sort of a government. I am satisfied that it will be that which their experience ultimately develops, through a process of evolution and possibly revolution; and it is bound to be, in the last analysis, the one best fitted for them. They have a right to govern themselves in that way, if they see fit to do so, without any superposition upon them of our ideas, of our notions, or of our instructions, always, of course, giving them the benefit of the educational system which has been so effective up to this time, and has been the one redeeming feature of our occupation of the islands.

Government? Why, Mr. President, I think it was Plato who said of all governments that in their last analysis they were always the government of the strongest men. Even in our own form of government it is the strong men who dominate, and who, by impressing their personality and influence and leadership upon the machinery of government, make it effective or direct it for better or for worse.

So, as far as the future is concerned, while, of course, we may be largely interested in the results of our tutelage of those people, nevertheless the duty before us is one which we owe to ourselves, and it imperatively requires that we get rid of a subject people as soon as possible.

I was much taken some time ago with a reflection of the English historian, Mr. Froude. It is appropriate to the discussion. He said:

If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is that free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

No more obvious truth was ever uttered.

These people, Mr. President, if we retain them, must become citizens, they must be admitted to our Constitution or the latter must fall because incompetent to discharge its functions. There can be no subjects in a republic. When he appears the republic becomes but a name. There can be, in a free republic, no subjects without doing violence to our institutions. They must be citizens if they stay; and those who oppose their independence must admit this or recognize a purpose of colonization. The present Speaker of the House of Representatives some time ago declared that the longer we continue to occupy these islands the greater the danger that politics may develop a situation which will ultimately lead to their admission as States of the Union. It is not, of course, improbable—indeed, it may be very likely—that if our constant occupation of these islands should lead to such a result the votes cast by an alien people 10,000 miles away might determine an election of a President of the United States at a most critical period in our political affairs.

Mr. President, I have not attempted any systematic discussion of this measure. But for the introduction of the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] I should have said nothing whatever upon it. But the amendment is, to my mind, the redeeming feature of the bill, and the criticism which I would make of it is that it does not go far enough. I should prefer to declare for their immediate independence. I think the analysis by Moorfield Storey of the Democratic platform upon the subject, as read here by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], is absolutely unanswerable. We have promised, ever since there was a Philippine question—and when I say "we," I mean the party to which I belong—we have pledged and declared over and over again that if and when we were restored to power we would give these people their independence. Now, we either meant it or we did not. I do not think there is any question about our candor and earnestness in this repeated declaration of good faith. But there will be if we ignore or disregard it.

I am glad we made it. It is true Democratic doctrine. It is an essential to the welfare of the people from the Democratic standpoint. It has become crystallized as a fixed principle of Democratic policy that upon our accession to power we would get rid of these islands. The only way to carry out that pledge, Mr. President, is to keep it by fixing some definite, arbitrary time when, regardless of consequences, the present relations between this Government and the Philippine Islands will terminate, when we will get out of there and come home, and when from that time onward the people of the islands will be left to themselves, to govern themselves as in their judgment they should and to look after their affairs in their own way.

My objection to this amendment is that the time suggested is too long, and that no contingency should be attached to the date when the bill becomes operative. But I am not one of those who rejects half a loaf because he can not get all that he wants. I think this, perhaps, is the best thing that can be done at present, the most efficacious thing, the most practical thing. Therefore I shall support this amendment, Mr. President, believing that in so doing I am not only following the dictates of my own judgment with regard to the question, but I am also carrying out and making effective the oft-repeated declarations of the Democratic Party upon this subject. I trust that when we are rid of the Philippines, when we have that episode of our history behind us, we will have learned a lesson from that experience so strong and so vivid and so constant as to make its repetition impossible.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1916.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 4.

Francis White, of Maryland, now a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5, to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America.

CLASS 5.

John Heath, of Palo Alto, Cal., to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5 of the United States of America.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Joseph T. Lyons, of Boston, Mass., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Winthrop T. Hodges, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frederick J. Sullivan, of Lawrence, Mass., to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Joseph T. Lyons, nominated for appraiser of merchandise.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Dennis Flynn, of Lowell, Mass., to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals and assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of William H. Parker, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Charles W. Early to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of September, 1915.

Lieut. Wilson Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1915.

Ensign Elmer De L. Langworthy to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Lawrence P. Bischoff to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Earl R. Morrissey to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Charles K. Osborne to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Asst. Paymaster Charles C. Copp to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1915.

Carpenter William E. Fitzgerald to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 15th day of November, 1915.

POSTMASTER.

NEW JERSEY.

John F. Sinnott to be postmaster at Newark, N. J., in place of Frank J. Bock. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1916.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph T. Johnson to be United States district judge, western district of South Carolina.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph F. McManus, Norwood.
Martin Ratigan, Whitman.

MONTANA.

Henry S. Paddock, Three Forks.

NEW JERSEY.

James Degnan, High Bridge.

OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Burke, Hobart.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Howard Kemrer, Paradise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 24, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the dignity Thou hast conferred upon man, for it is writ, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor; Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet."

Give us therefore the courage of our convictions that whatsoever we put our hands to this day we may glorify Thee and thus glorify ourselves in the work whereunto Thou hast called us, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in all our hearts; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, January 22, 1916, and Sunday, January 23, 1916, were read and approved.

PARCEL POST.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the parcel post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the parcel post. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of preparedness and national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing of the business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of national preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I may address the House for 30 minutes upon the same general subject.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for another day. We are right in the middle of the consideration of the good-roads bill. If we do not finish the bill to-morrow it will run us into Calendar Wednesday, with other important matters coming up. Why can not the gentleman wait for a day or two?

Mr. BENNET. I ask for only 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the same general subject of preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. HOWARD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. HOWARD. To submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record by publishing a letter from Hon. Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., which is a criticism of H. R. 6838, known as the Moss rural-credit bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter written by Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., on the Moss rural-credit bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Georgia the length of the communication and what the nature of it is?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, I will state that Mr. Davis is considered, in my judgment and by all of the people who have devoted any study to the question of rural credits, to be one of the greatest experts on that subject in the United States. He was the secretary to a former joint committee of the House and Senate, and practically drafted all of the organization features of every bill that is now before Congress for everyone who introduced them. He knows more about the question and is more vitally interested in it, from the standpoint of the farmers of the country, than any man I know of. This is a reply to a communication addressed to him by me, asking him to take the Moss bill and criticize it from the standpoint of an expert, and he has done so, and I will say to the gentleman that he has criticized it down to the bone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

ACTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1916.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE:

Desiring to be absent from my office for a short period of time, I hereby designate the Chief Clerk of the House, J. C. South, Esq., to sign all papers that may require my official signature, and to do all other acts under the rules and practice of the House required to be done by the Clerk of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House.

PRINTING BILL.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, and ask to have it read from the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARNHART asks unanimous consent that House bill No. 8664, known as the printing bill, be given a privileged status, with one hour's general debate, subject to preference being given to consideration of appropriation, revenue, and regularly privileged bills, and with the definite agreement that while this bill is being considered it may be displaced at any time for the consideration of the aforesaid bills.

Mr. BARNHART. And other bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that there are other bills that are to be proposed that are not privileged, but that are of very great importance, a part of the program of this session of Congress, and for the present I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Until at least the good-roads bill gets out of the way, and when that is out of the way, if there is nothing else, I may not object.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, rural post roads, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is well known by my fellow Members upon this floor that I heartily favor Government aid to good roads. I have heretofore, on more than one occasion, discussed this great question, in which the people are so vitally interested, on the floor of this House.

When the bill appropriating \$25,000,000 for the improvement of good roads passed the House of Representatives in 1912, which I am sorry did not pass the Senate, I had the honor and pleasure of making the closing speech in favor of that bill, and was very much gratified to receive from Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, the present chairman of the Roads Committee,

and the distinguished gentleman who is now in charge of this bill on the floor of the House, a letter thanking me for my assistance on that occasion. I hope it will not be deemed indelicate on my part to read you that letter, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 30, 1912.

MY DEAR MR. CANDLER: I must go away to-night and be gone for some days. I will not be able to see you before I go, so I write this note to thank you for persistent and intelligent assistance rendered in the preparation and passage of the so-called Shackleford good-roads bill. You did splendid service in getting the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture. I believe it was upon your motion that the bill was reported. But the best of it all was your masterful speech in closing the debate on the bill in the House to-day. It was a complete and convincing answer to those who argued that our measure was undemocratic. The people owe you much thanks for your efforts in their behalf.

With best wishes, I am,

Your friend,

DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD.

[Applause.]

I heartily supported the bill on that occasion and I with equal enthusiasm support the pending bill. On the first day of this session of Congress I introduced a bill on this subject myself. Quite a number of bills were introduced by other Members of Congress, and this bill is presented as a composite bill, intended to utilize the best features of various bills on this subject. This bill has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and has received the unanimous approval of every member of the Committee on Roads, and hence it is evident that this measure has a more unanimous and larger support than any other bill could possibly secure, and therefore it is evident that the best course to pursue is for every Member who honestly and sincerely favors Government aid to good roads to get behind this bill and by vote and influence put forth every effort to secure its passage. If it does not measure up fully to all the varied conditions existing throughout the country, when it is put into operation, that will be made evident, and it can then be so amended as to meet future emergencies and contingencies. The bill is as follows:

A bill (7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart; that not more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

Sec. 2. That out of an appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act, and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

Sec. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State, and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department, and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance, and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make

payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such materials and supplies, and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

SEC. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

In section 5 it will be noticed it is stated that—
one of the purposes of this act is to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

The purpose, therefore, is to benefit our agricultural interests.

It will be seen by reading this bill that it provides that each and every State shall receive an arbitrary amount of \$65,000, and in addition to this a proportionate amount in accordance with the number and length of the rural-delivery routes and the star routes and the population within the State. It is estimated that Mississippi would receive \$497,130 each year under this bill. This is probably the fairest apportionment which could be made. If this measure is passed it will be a beginning of this great development in the United States, and as time may show it to be necessary the good work can be increased and enlarged as good policy and necessity may indicate and require.

This is no new question. The first American road law was passed by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1632. The Egyptians, Persians, and Romans built roads in their day. The present system of roads in France was founded by Napoleon. England had road legislation as early as 1285. The nations beyond the seas now have splendid roads, and it is time for this great Republic—the greatest in the history of the world—to begin and press to success the improvement of the highways in the interest of all the people. The Democratic Party in its last national platform declared in favor of National aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads. We must redeem that pledge if we keep faith with the people. Our forefathers, as time has demonstrated, builded well in their day, and in the first 50 or 60 years in the history of this Republic something like \$14,000,000 was appropriated for the building and maintenance of public highways, and during the time the construction of the Cumberland Road was accomplished. Let us now gather inspiration from their splendid example and carry to consummation this great enterprise. [Applause.] There is nothing that would benefit the people more than good roads. They will increase the value of land, put neighbors closer together, bring the schoolhouses and churches nearer, and with their convenience exercise a beneficent influence which will bless all mankind. We have given to our rural population rural delivery of the mails and the parcel post, and now let us add to this a system of good roads and a rural-credit system, backed by Government aid, and this country will blossom like the rose, and prosperity, like the blessed sunshine, will shed its inspiring influence in every neighborhood in this magnificent Republic. Congress has waited too long now to give the people good roads and a rural-credit system. They need money at low rates of interest with which to improve their farms and produce their products, and good roads over which to transport their products to market. Both these great measures have been promised by the Democratic Party, and we are in control of this Government, and if we are to deserve and receive the further confidence of the people we must keep faith with them and redeem these two among our most important pledges and promises made to them. I voted for a rural-credit bill last Congress and shall gladly do so again, and do all I can to secure legislation. I heartily favor the passage of this road bill and will vote for it with pleasure, and I earnestly urge every friend of the people in this House to support it and thus make certain its passage. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it is with deepest regret that I follow the arguments which have been advanced by certain gentlemen on the floor of this House against this worthy measure. I am surprised that gentlemen who have spoken so ably and so well on other important questions should take the stand that has been taken against this bill.

To my mind it would appear that every sane and thinking American citizen can not but admit that any improvement in the roads throughout the country will result in benefit to the cities.

Transportation has brought people closer together and made commercial intercourse easier. Our great railroads have made it possible for thousands of American citizens to reach and develop land which otherwise would still be dormant.

In 1832 the railroads of the United States were operating 229 miles of track. Three years later, through the help of Congress, they were operating 1,098 miles of track. At the opening of the Civil War railroad mileage had been increased to 31,286 miles, and to-day they are operating over 260,000 miles of track.

Our interurban electric railways have brought cities and towns closer together, and these lines are now penetrating sections of the country which could not be reached by steam roads. Electric railways have made it possible for thousands of our city population to move into the suburbs and secure better and cheaper homes.

If Congress can be induced to give the same assistance to public roads as was given to railroads when steam transportation was so sorely in need of assistance, I feel sure that the country at large will benefit to an even greater extent than it did through the loan by Congress, which was the means of the beginning of this great development in railroad construction.

But the highways of the country, I regret to say, have been criminally neglected by our Nation. If they had received the same attention as the railroads and electric railways, our country would have a perfect system of highways, which, bringing the producer closer to the consumer, would do much to reduce the cost of living in this country.

In the last 20 years we have expended over \$2,000,000,000 for our Army and Navy. If one-twentieth of that sum had been expended on our roads, I feel sure that the country would have been benefited to a much greater extent than it has through the expenditure of this immense sum for the maintenance of Army posts which protect us against savage Indians long since dead and the maintenance of a large Navy to protect us against foreign enemies who would be obliged to transport their armies over 3,000 miles of water before they could land on our shores. With every foreign power bankrupt, the gentlemen would appropriate still larger sums to build up a Navy to protect us against enemies from whose sting the venom has been removed for 20 years to come. The gentlemen will readily appropriate millions of dollars for the maintenance of troops in the Philippine Islands and the Panama Canal, but ask them to spend a like amount for the improvement of our home territory and they are deaf.

If the gentlemen are looking for war, if they are expecting it, let them take into consideration the fact that armies must be moved from one section of the country to another and that immense quantities of supplies must also be transported. It is not always that railroads can be depended on for this transportation, and in that event we must look to our highways to solve the problem of shifting troops and supplies.

In these times of peace every progressive district and every enterprising town is devoting a great deal of thought and energy to the improvement of its roads, and it is high time that the National Government should do likewise.

I believe in economy, but not in false economy. I believe that the money that this bill calls for will be a splendid investment, and feel confident that the people of the United States will receive from it greater benefits than they would from any other project to which it might be applied.

I do not share the fear of some of my colleagues that the improvement of the roads will benefit the rural districts alone. Anything that is of benefit to the producing area must of necessity be of benefit to the cities.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and I shall cast my vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I observe with regret and pain that some of my esteemed colleagues from the large cities and thickly populated communities object strenuously to the expenditure of money to help construct roads in rural communities sparsely settled. I beg to remind the gentlemen that while God made the country and man made the cities, the best men

who have made the best cities, with very few brilliant and distinguished exceptions, came from the country that God made and will continue to do so. [Applause.]

I wish to call their attention to the injustice of requiring that these partially settled communities, in the very territory whence the resources as well as the men come, to build up and perpetuate the cities, should build their own roads, all of which tend to the benefit of the cities.

And I wish to say to the committee that I am corroborated by very strong authority in that line. Macaulay, writing of the situation in England in the seventeenth century, said:

One chief cause of the badness of the roads seems to have been the defective state of the law. Every parish was bound to repair the highways which passed through it. The peasantry were forced to give their gratuitous labor six days in the year. If this was not sufficient, hired labor was employed, and the expense was met by a parochial rate. That a route connecting two great towns, which have a large and thriving trade with each other, should be maintained at the cost of the rural population scattered between them is obviously unjust; and this injustice was peculiarly glaring in the case of the great North Road, which traversed very poor and thinly inhabited districts and joined very rich and populous districts. Indeed, it was not in the power of the parishes of Huntingdonshire to mend a highway worn by the constant traffic between the West Riding of Yorkshire and London. Soon after the Restoration this grievance attracted the notice of Parliament, and an act, the first of our many turnpike acts, was passed, imposing a small toll on travelers and goods for the purpose of keeping some parts of this important line of communication in good repair.

In a city or a thickly settled community the number of people interested, traveling the road and paying tax, make it easy per capita to defray the expense of a good road, but in a sparsely settled country it would be too onerous on the people, none of whom are wealthy, to keep in order long stretches of road, mainly to be used by people from the cities traveling over them.

The people in my part of the country are accepting and acting upon those views. The cities and large towns are actively cooperating with the intervening rural communities and are helping to build good roads connecting the cities, large towns, and county seats, but they ought to have assistance from the Government. In the large cities and populous and wealthy communities that have already been blessed with the bounteous benefits of the rapid growth and unparalleled prosperity of this country the past hundred years are the last ones who ought to object to a fair and equitable plan for aiding in the construction of roads through the parts of the country less fortunate, up to this time, in population and prosperity. Their resources and prospects are so fine as to insure ample returns to the Government and the rest of the people for all the assistance that can be rendered now. The objection is shortsighted and ungracious.

I have been introducing bills for many years and have conferred and cooperated with the authors of other bills which promised any benefits to the people of the rural communities, and I shall vote for this bill, not because I believe it is the best bill, but because I believe it is the only one we can agree upon, and it does possess great merit.

I presume all are more or less acquainted with the wretched condition of the roads in many of the rural communities, especially where in bad wintry weather the people are compelled to use their vehicles in going to and from market. I can not better describe the situation in some of the communities than to read you the following extracts from Macaulay's History of England describing very similar conditions:

The chief cause which made the fusion of the different elements of society so imperfect was the extreme difficulty which our ancestors found in passing from place to place. Of all inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilization of our species. Every improvement of the means of locomotion benefits mankind morally and intellectually as well as materially, and not only facilitates the interchange of the various productions of nature and art, but tends to remove the national and provincial antipathies and to bind together all the branches of the great human family. In the seventeenth century the inhabitants of London were, for almost every practical purpose, farther from Reading than they now are from Edinburgh, and farther from Edinburgh than they now are from Vienna.

The subjects of Charles the Second were not, it is true, quite unacquainted with that principle which has, in our own times, produced an unprecedented revolution in human affairs, which has enabled navies to advance in face of wind and tide, and brigades of troops, attended by all their baggage and artillery, to traverse kingdoms at a pace equal to that of the fleetest race horse. The Marquis of Worcester had recently observed the expansive power of moisture rarefied by heat. After many experiments he had succeeded in constructing a rude steam engine, which he called a fire waterwork, and which he pronounced to be an admirable and most forcible instrument of propulsion. But the marquis was suspected to be a madman, and known to be a Papist. His inventions, therefore, found no favorable reception. His fire waterwork might, perhaps, furnish matter for conversation at a meeting of the Royal Society, but was not applied to any practical purposes.

It was by the highways that both travelers and goods generally passed from place to place, and those highways appear to have been far worse than might be expected from the degree of wealth and civilization which the nation had even then attained. On the best lines of communication the ruts were deep, the descents precipitous, and the way often such as it was hardly possible to distinguish in the dusk from the uninclosed heath and fen which lay on both sides. Ralph Thoresby, the antiquary, was in danger of losing his way on the great

North Road, between Barnby Moor and Tuxford, and actually lost his way between Doncaster and York. Pepys and his wife, traveling in their own coach, lost their way between Newbury and Reading. In the course of the same tour they lost their way near Salisbury and were in danger of having to pass the night on the plain. It was only in fine weather that the whole breadth of the road was available for wheeled vehicles. Often the mud lay deep on the right and left and only a narrow track of firm ground rose above the quagmire. At such times obstructions and quarrels were frequent, and the path was sometimes blocked up during a long time by carriers, neither of whom would break the way. It happened almost every day that coaches stuck fast until a team of cattle could be procured from some neighboring farm to tug them out of the slough. But in bad seasons the traveler had to encounter inconveniences still more serious. Thoresby, who was in the habit of traveling between Leeds and the capital, has recorded in his Diary such a series of perils and disasters as might suffice for a journey to the frozen ocean or to the Desert of Sahara.

He was afterwards detained at Stamford four days on account of the state of the roads, and then ventured to proceed only because 14 members of the House of Commons, who were going up in a body, took him into their company. On the roads of Derbyshire travelers were in constant fear for their necks and were frequently compelled to alight and lead their beasts. The great route through Wales to Holyhead was in such a state that, in 1685, a viceroy going to Ireland was five hours in traveling 14 miles, from St. Asaph to Conway. Between Conway and Beaumaris he was forced to walk a great part of the way, and his lady was carried in a litter. His coach was with much difficulty and by the help of many hands brought after him entire. In general, carriages were taken to pieces at Conway and borne on the shoulders of stout Welsh peasants to the Menai Straits. In some parts of Kent and Sussex none but the strongest horses could in winter get through the bog, in which at every step they sank deep. The markets were often inaccessible during several months. It is said that the fruits of the earth were sometimes suffered to rot in one place, while in another place, distant only a few miles, the supply fell far short in the demand. The wheeled carriages were in the district generally pulled by oxen. When Prince George of Denmark visited the stately mansion of Petworth in wet weather he was six hours in going 9 miles; and it was necessary that a body of sturdy hinds should be on each side of his coach in order to prop it. Of the carriages which conveyed his retinue, several were upset and injured. A letter from one of the party has been preserved, in which the unfortunate courtier complains that during 14 hours he never once alighted except when his coach overturned or stuck fast in the mud.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, it is needless for me to say that I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. I have in former Congresses worked for and supported similar measures for Government aid to the construction of post roads in the United States. This bill was reported from the Committee on Roads, of which I am a member. The committee had before it many bills to consider; while they differed in their provisions and language used, yet the object sought was the same, all providing for aid by the Federal Government in the construction of highways in the interior country of the United States. What I may say on this subject will, to a large measure, be what I have heretofore said upon this floor in advocating the passage of legislation along the line of the provisions of this bill. In fact, it seems to me it would be almost impossible to advance a new idea upon this subject, as so many gentlemen in previous Congresses and at the present session have discussed this subject, and all that could possibly be said has been said.

Some objection has been raised to the provisions of this bill, and it has been said that its provisions were not as good as the bill that passed the House during the Sixty-third Congress. I confess that I can not say that I like the provisions of the pending bill better than I did the bill passed by the House in the Sixty-third Congress, yet after hearing the ideas advanced by different advocates of the measure in committee, and after the question was thoroughly considered by our committee, it was thought best to report the bill that is now being considered. If the desire of Members to speak in favor of this bill indicates the way they are to vote, I take it that there will be a very small vote against its passage; in fact, it looks as if the vote would be all one way.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000,000, and under its provisions the Secretary of Agriculture would first apportion to each of the States \$65,000 and the remainder of the twenty-five million would be then divided among the several States as follows: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such States bears to the mileage of the rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States, as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General. The administration and expenditure of the money hereby appro-

priated is under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting in conjunction with the State highway departments of the several States or the person charged with the duty of looking after the highways in States having no highway department. I agree with the provision which places the control and expenditure of this money in the Secretary of Agriculture. This power must be delegated to some one, and we must proceed upon the assumption and theory that any officer qualified will exercise it with discretion and good faith and to the best interest of those who are to receive the benefits of same. Again, I can see an advantage to be gained.

It is true that men in the rural districts charged with the administration of road funds and road laws, however conscientious and earnest they may be, can not be skilled in road engineering, and for this reason most all of the highway departments of the States extend the aid of the highway departments to the local road authorities. Under the provisions of this bill the highway commission, upon the application of the road district, will send an engineer to provide scientific road construction and give advice as to the best material for road improvement in the immediate locality where the road is to be constructed. Without such engineering and without such advice of some one skilled in road construction the officials in the rural communities would often be helpless and would not be in a position to properly construct the roads.

What is now being done in many States by local legislation is proposed to be done under this bill by the Federal road departments and will result in great road improvement, thus giving to the local communities all of the scientific knowledge by the Office of Good Roads after years of study and expense. The Secretary of Agriculture will be able to be at the service of the local road officials of the States by giving them the assistance of expert engineers and road builders, who are familiar with the construction of roads in different parts of the United States; familiar with the quality of material available in the different sections; familiar with the process of drainage, which is an important feature in road construction; familiar with all the details which reduce the cost of road construction and improvement and which result in a more economic up-keep of the same.

In my State we have 957 rural routes, with an aggregate length of 25,504 miles; we also have 288 star routes, with an aggregate length of 4,125 miles; hence the amount that would be apportioned to Oklahoma under the provisions of the pending bill would be \$532,138. While this amount is small, it will materially aid in the much-needed and long-delayed work of road building in the rural communities of the State. If this bill becomes a law, it will benefit more people than any measure that has been passed by Congress in many years.

The passage of this bill is not political in its nature, and in discussing its provisions no one can be charged with supporting the measure because it is political. I am indeed anxious to see legislation giving to the States aid in construction of post roads throughout the United States. I very much regret to hear any gentleman speak in opposition to this measure; however, I find no fault and do not feel like criticizing anyone who honestly opposes any measure that is being considered by this House. Any gentleman has a right to his views, and he is responsible to his constituents for his vote, and if he, after study, is convinced that it is not proper and beneficial legislation, I honor him for saying so; but I do appeal to his better judgment and ask him not to vote against this measure from a selfish motive or because he feels his section of the country will not profit thereby. All of the people of the United States will be benefited if this measure becomes a law. I regret very much to see my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] oppose the pending legislation. Last Congress he voted with those who desired to see the measure become a law, yet if he has by study and research convinced himself that he should not support this measure because his constituents do not need it, and in his opinion it will not benefit the communities; that it is not just legislation and not such an enterprise as the Government of the United States should enter upon, I take it that it is his duty to oppose it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Walsh] in the course of his remarks calls some of these roads that are sought to be improved "cow paths." May I not suggest to the gentlemen that these roads as arteries of commerce are contributing largely to the upbuilding of large cities in the New England States, and to the great city of Boston, from which the gentleman comes. The wealth of the cities was not produced in the cities. No city in any part of the United States produced its wealth and no city would long remain a city if it had to depend upon the products manufactured and produced within that city. But the great wealth of the metropolis of New York and every large city was produced

from the rural sections of the United States and centralized, because of the great advantages of commerce and the methods of transportation of the products to the different parts of the world.

The city and the country must each rely upon the other, and it is by an exchange of their commodities that keeps our commerce going and maintains our producing powers, consequently it is not a question of city or town against the country, but it is as much the interest of the individual in the city and town to see that the producer of wealth from the farm in the rural districts is provided with good facilities for transporting his products from the farm to market as it is to see that they have good streets and sidewalks in the city.

The question of Government aid in the construction of public roads or the question of road building in the United States has for many years been discussed, but within the last few years a greater interest is being manifested and a greater realization for the necessity of road construction has been brought forward than ever before in the history of our Government. It is easy to understand why, because of the fact that our cities and towns are being so densely populated that it has become necessary that a greater acreage of lands in the country must be cultivated to maintain and support them, and in order that the farms may be properly cultivated, and society built up in the rural communities, that the people have awakened to the necessity of road building and believe that the Government should assist them in the construction of the same.

It is true that at present great agitation exists regarding the question of our Government being prepared to meet a foreign foe, and that the War and Navy Departments are advocating large expenditures for the purpose of strengthening our Army and Navy, our coast defenses, and that the same has been presented to Congress by our President; yet with all of the anxiety and desire for preparedness that is presented not one sentence, not one effort, not one move is made to prepare our cross-country roads for the proper defense should it become necessary to move our armies from one place in the United States to another. At present we would necessarily have to rely upon the steam railroad for transportation. A large portion of the success of the German Army in the unfortunate war that is now raging in the East has been brought about by reason of the fact that they heretofore constructed good roads, and such roads that they could transport thereon their heavy artillery and their necessary munitions of war, and do not have to rely upon railway transportation.

It will be but a few days until many of the gentlemen who are opposing this measure will be called upon to cast their vote for preparedness, and before that time comes I hope they will have a change of heart and be willing to assist those favoring an appropriation for good roads, and by their vote show to the people that they are willing to give them an opportunity to better the conditions in the rural communities of the United States.

Every man on the floor of this House must depend upon the products of the farm, and the cheaper you can bring these products to the door of the consumer the better off we will all be. Therefore it seems to me that the pending bill now under consideration is the wisest piece of legislation we have had before us for some time, and I wonder why the Government of the United States has neglected this proposition for such a great number of years, as it has been assisting every other enterprise, as I will show before I conclude my remarks, but so far has overlooked the construction of dirt roads in rural communities. This Government has constructed roads in our Territorial and insular possessions and has expended millions in constructing roads and trails in Alaska. It has expended great sums in the Canal Zone, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and we have now reached the point where we should assist the people at home by extending aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, which are now established and used by the Government under the supervision of the Post Office Department for the carrying of mail. This aid will have a direct effect of benefiting all those who reside in the rural communities in the way of providing a means for the farmer to get his products to market, and those residing in the cities and towns will have the benefit of getting the products delivered to their doors daily.

The United States is the only progressive Nation in the world that has not given great consideration to the construction of its highways and the improvement of its internal traffic. All of the progressive nations of Europe are giving national aid to their highways, while this Government has neglected to extend aid, and has thereby imposed a burden of millions of dollars annually on our producers. Quite a different condition exists in the countries of Europe. There a splendid system of roads

has been inaugurated. During the days of Napoleon, following the example set by the Roman Empire, an extensive system of road building was established throughout France, and many millions of dollars are expended yearly by that Government in the construction and maintenance of their roads.

The improvement of our inland highways by our Government not only cheapens the necessities of life but furnishes employment for many thousand of laborers who need the work. The farming population of this country constitutes about 35 per cent of the total population of the United States, and it is unfair to expect this large per cent to construct, unaided, the highways of this country. They should not be required to construct the roads over which they must haul their product to the consumer; at least the consumer should be required to contribute his share of the expense, as he receives as great a benefit as the farmer. All must admit that the farmer is the real producer of the Nation, and all must admit that he creates the wealth of the Nation, which largely finds its way into the pockets of other people, yet the producer has been required, unaided, to maintain and construct his roads over which he travels to the commercial centers of the United States.

Anyone who desires to be fair, even though he may reside in a city, will concede that there is no unfairness or unjustness in an appropriation by the Government to construct and maintain highways, and I rejoice to see the Members of this House who reside in city districts giving their aid to this bill. It shows conclusively that the city Members are patriotic and fair-minded business men and view this question in an economical way, and they realize all must be benefited by this appropriation. At no time in the history of our Government has there been as close relation between the people on the farms and the people in the cities. The rural mail routes and the rural telephone has done much to bring the country and city together, and the effect of this bill, should it become a law, will result largely in causing the young men and young women of the country to remain at home, as they will have all the advantages of the city life and at the same time enjoy the free out of doors and pure open air. At this time the high cost of living renders it important that we should seriously consider the question of transportation, and we should do all in our power to bring the cost of transportation to the lowest minimum. Transportation is now a paramount question. All civilized countries of the world have progressed rapidly along this line, and the great change made in the last decade is wonderful.

We have but three methods of transportation, viz, water navigation, railroads, and wagon roads. Each of the three depend largely upon the other. The railroad can not exist without the aid of the wagon road, and neither the wagon road or the railroad can properly perform their functions of upbuilding a nation without water transportation. Each of these methods has an important duty to perform, not only in the local community, but in an interstate and foreign commerce. Two of these methods of transportation are owned and controlled largely by private corporations and are operated for gain. The third method, or the wagon-road transportation, is controlled by the State and is free to all of its citizens.

Our Government imposes a duty on many articles of life, an internal revenue and corporation tax, which, in all respects, places an additional cost upon the articles and fixes a charge on the article by the corporation paying the tax. All of our citizens are taxed in one way or the other and proportionately to the amount they purchase and consume.

The railroads of the United States have grown in magnitude and efficiency until we have perfected the greatest railroad system in the world. Our navigable streams and Great Lakes are crowded with vessels large and small, all engaged in interstate traffic. Rivers and harbors are provided for annually by our Government, and large appropriations are made yearly for their improvement; and we also make large appropriations annually for the construction of public buildings throughout the United States. In the past our Government has donated millions of acres of land as a subsidy to railroad companies to induce them to construct railroads, yet practically nothing has been done for the improvement of dirt roads or national highways. We have to-day in the United States daily Rural Delivery Service, which traverses about 42,000 miles of different highways of the Nation, coming in daily contact with more than 20,000,000 people living in the rural districts. I do not anticipate that anyone will seriously oppose the passage of this bill in the House, but if they should do so, I desire to invite their attention to the fact heretofore mentioned that in the early construction of railroads throughout the United States land was donated to the railroads as an inducement to the corporations to construct their lines, at an estimated value now of more than \$1,000,000,000. There has been appropriated for rivers and harbors since 1875, \$592,395,000;

for the building of levees alone to June, 1902, \$16,582,000; for the construction of public buildings up to June, 1911, \$213,376,000. Again, we have expended nearly \$400,000,000 on the Panama Canal; for the construction of roads in Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and the Territory of Alaska, \$8,300,000.

The United States now has an estimated mileage of rural roads and highways amounting to 2,199,645, of which only 190,769 miles are improved. When you mention the number of miles of highways in the United States those who are disposed to oppose an appropriation for the improvement of rural roads may suggest that it would bankrupt the Government if we undertook to lend aid to the States in the improvement of roads; but it is estimated by the Office of Public Roads that 90 per cent of the traffic is confined to less than 30 per cent of the roads, and that the improvement of 440,000 miles of public roads would practically satisfy the demands of the country. If this estimate of the Office of Public Roads is correct, the improvement of our rural roads is not an undertaking so gigantic as one would suppose; at least, it is not as great an appropriation as Federal pensions and the maintaining of our Army and Navy, nor would the appropriation reach a sum as great as was added to the Federal pension rolls a few days ago, which passed the House without any serious objection; and in that connection I might say that I was heartily in favor of the recent pension bill and supported it, because I believe it to be right and believe the Government should look to the protection and convenience of those who fought for it in time of war, keeping in mind all the time the merit and efficiency necessary to maintain the Government.

I now think the time has come when we should consider the interest of those who live in the rural communities and provide for the improvement of our internal highways, so that those living in the rural district may reap as great benefit from the Government as those living in cities, on railroads, and navigable streams.

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1910 discloses that the tariff revenue aggregated \$331,683,445; and the Government census of 1910 shows that we have 18,400,000 families in the United States. If you will apportion this tariff revenue among the families of the United States, each family is entitled to \$18.13. The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the gross earnings of the railroads for the same period shows an aggregate of \$2,787,266,136. Divide this amount by the number of families in the United States and you will find that each family paid a tax to the railroads for transportation of \$151.48. The total amount of freight handled by the railroads for the fiscal years 1906 and 1907 was 1,100,000,000 tons. It is estimated that at least one-half of this tonnage was hauled to and from the railroad by wagons, and it would be fair to estimate that as much as one-third more was hauled to the consumer by wagons, on what may be termed a "second hauling," making a total of 800,000,000 tons hauled by wagons. In addition to this, a large bulk of the cotton crop, which amounts to practically 3,000,000 tons annually, is hauled from the farm to the gin, thence back to the farm, and finally to the railroad or to water navigation. It should also be stated that large quantities of agricultural, forest, and miscellaneous products are first hauled in their crude state over the rural roads before they reach the railroads and waterways, thus necessitating a rehauling of these products. So it is perfectly fair to estimate that the per capita transportation tax on the people of this country amounts to \$53.37, as against a tariff tax of \$18.13.

It is estimated by Mr. Page, the director of the Office of Public Roads, who is an expert on road building and wagon transportation, after a careful study of the question, that the cost of wagon transportation over the improved roads of England, Germany, and France by wagon is only 10 cents per ton per mile, but eliminating any doubt as to the cost in these countries of transporting a ton a mile by wagon we will say that it amounts to 12½ cents per ton. If by the construction of good roads in this country we can reduce the cost of wagon transportation from 25 cents per ton per mile, which it now costs, to 12½ cents per ton per mile, we will save the people of our country on this item alone, at the very least calculation, \$500,000,000 yearly.

Investigation shows that the cost to the American farmer is about 1.6 cents more to haul a bushel of wheat a distance of 9.4 miles from his farm to the neighboring railroads than it does to ship from New York to Liverpool, a distance of 3,100 miles. If we had a system of good roads throughout the country, the farmers would save in the cost of wagon transportation of the cotton crop yearly \$5,076,183; of the wheat crop, \$10,256,058; of the corn crop, \$12,709,278; whereas it now costs for wagon transportation to get these three great crops to market twice this sum.

The question of reduction in the cost of getting the crops to market is not the only benefit to be derived from good roads throughout the rural districts, because statistics show that good roads in a community adds from \$2 to \$10 per acre to the land value, and the total area of farm lands in the United States in 1900 was shown to be about 850,000,000 acres, an estimated increase of \$5 per acre. If such an amount should be added to the value of the land by the construction of good roads, it would enhance the taxable value of the farm lands \$4,250,000.

The great disadvantage that now confronts the American farmer is that he must market his crops when the roads are good, and he is not permitted to hold them until the demand is the greatest and the price is the highest. The present condition of rural roads throughout the United States renders it practically impossible to market his crops during the winter months. It matters not what price he is paid, he must market his crops when the roads are passable.

Another great item to be considered in this matter is that the farmer is required to do his hauling when the roads are good, and when the roads are good it is usually pretty weather, and he should be devoting his time in the fields. If good roads are established, the farmer will be permitted to do his hauling when his fields are too wet to work, and thus save him a large amount of time which he would otherwise lose.

For the last few years we have been continuously hearing the cry from every source, "Back to the farm." The intelligent boys and girls of our rural districts are seeking to escape the social conditions prevalent in the country during the long, dreary winter months of the year, attributable almost entirely to the bad roads. The drift of our population from the rural districts to the cities is really becoming alarming, yet if we improve the roads we will remedy this condition and largely eliminate this desire to get to the cities. The telephone and rural free delivery has done much to satisfy those who live on the farm, and if we would lend aid in the construction of public roads, instead of the dreary winter months in the rural communities farm life would be more enjoyable and profitable. Bad roads prevent attendance at school and church; they make literary societies, social gatherings, club and lodge meetings practically impossible during the bad weather.

I have had an opportunity to learn personally of the conditions that exist in the rural districts, and have had actual experience and know of the inconveniences that go with country life a distance from the railroads. I was born and reared quite a distance from the railroad, and I know how difficult it is to get to and from the market places over unimproved roads.

Another great benefit to all of the people, regardless of citizenship in any State, which will be derived is the good effect it will have upon the rising generation in the rural communities, and, in my judgment, the improvements of country roads will make country life more pleasant, more enjoyable, and more profitable, and will be the strongest inducement to cause the young boys and girls to remain on the farm, and the question of supply and demand and high price of food products will almost be solved. I feel that within a few generations we will have improved roads throughout the United States, and few, I take it, will prefer the crowded city life to the freedom of outdoors in the country.

Another great benefit to be derived is that it provides better facilities and better opportunities for school and church attendance, and this means, of course, a stronger and better government. If we make a provision for the improvements of roads, it will increase the attendance at schools and churches and will in every way tend to upbuild the intellectual and moral standards of every community in the United States. There is no good reason that can be urged against the passage of this bill. No one who knows anything at all about country life can doubt that internal improvements is one of the best assets a country can have, and this improvement will advance and establish better government, better morals, better citizens, and promote social intercourse. The passage of this bill will materially cause the people in the country and the people in the cities to come closer together.

I want to see the day when every farmer can haul his product to market over good roads, without being forced to drive in mud up to the hub of his wagon. I want to see the day when every farmer can travel with pleasure, the same as the man in the city, who has the advantages of paved streets. It is nothing more than right that we should assist in the improvement of the post roads as provided in this bill.

There is one other advantage to be gained by the passage of this bill which I desire to touch upon, and that is the relief it will extend to the rural mail carriers and the star-route carriers. These men are compelled to expose themselves daily to all kinds of weather. The passage of this bill will lessen their

burdens and lessen the wear and tear on their teams and equipment. I want to see the improvement of the post roads for that reason; and, another thing, I want to see the day when these rural mail carriers are given sufficient wages to compensate them for the great amount of labor they are performing. Take into consideration the fact that these carriers are required to expose themselves and perform their duties in season and out of season, and compare that fact with the compensation they are now receiving and I think you will agree with me that they should be paid better wages.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am anxious to see this bill pass and become a law, and I hope that in the future the appropriations may be greatly increased and that the Government will, with the cooperation of the several States in the Union, rapidly construct a system of highways throughout the Nation which will be the best of any Government in the world and, in my judgment, when constructed, will be the greatest asset and the richest legacy which we will leave to posterity as a monument of the wisdom of the legislators of Congress.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentlemen on the other side to use some of their time.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the roads bill in the last House reported from the Committee on Roads. I am under the impression that I voted for a roads bill in the Sixty-second Congress, although some one intimated the other day that I did not. I do not know, and it is not material. I never vote for a bill trying to deceive myself as to what it means or what its effect will be. I have no doubt that the General Government will soon be engaged in aiding in the construction of roads throughout the country. And while the bills which have been reported heretofore carried authorization of \$25,000,000, no one knows how much will be appropriated in a few years for that purpose. If we commence with an initial appropriation of \$25,000,000, and that is successful, it is very likely that the sum will be very largely increased. This bill will undoubtedly pass this House, on the theory that it is in aid of the farmers. Now, I am not going to deceive myself about that proposition. The bill that was passed in the Sixty-second Congress was for the aid of country roads, roads which lead by the farmer's house, roads which are ordinarily not improved very much, and not usually in very good order; roads upon which the farmer really hauls his product a few miles to market; and perhaps my view of the subject may not be as broad or as informing as the views of others, because I live in a State and was raised in a portion of a State where no farmer hauls his produce many miles to market. We have a railroad every few miles in the State of Illinois. The farmers do not now, as they did when Illinois was first settled, have to haul their wheat 50 to 150 miles over a country road to market. He now hauls his grain a short distance to a car, or a warehouse, or a railroad.

That may not be the case entirely throughout the country, and is not, and there might be some reason—and there is—for the improvement of roads in order to aid the farmer to haul his crops or his produce to market; and yet in the main the products of all farms are carried to the real market by water or by rail—principally by rail.

But the theory of the first bill was to aid these country roads. There was quite a dramatic fight in the House between those who believed in aiding the country roads on the one side and those who were more or less susceptible to the influences of the automobile associations on the other side.

In the last Congress the bill was on a 50-50 plan. It gave authority to aid in the construction of the small or less improved country roads or the roads that the automobile people want. This bill is purely for the purpose of building automobile roads. Farmers will receive incidental benefit, but the highway commissioners of the various States in the main have been created through influences emanating from the manufacturers of automobiles.

Now, I do not say that it is not a good thing to build good roads in order that people may travel by automobiles, or that

that may not be in the interest of the farmers, because in some of the States—and I hope it may be true as to most of them—the farmers are not behindhand at all in the owning or using of automobiles.

But I am not going to vote for this bill at this time for this reason: I believe the Government can well afford, when it has the money, to appropriate it in aid of the construction of roads, whether they be through routes mainly used by automobiles or local routes mainly used by farmers for local work. But I do not believe that the General Government ought to levy special taxes upon a few for the purpose of constructing roads or beginning the construction of roads. We propose here an expenditure of \$25,000,000 a year. That is just a little less than the special stamp taxes amount to. For the last fiscal year, when the emergency tax law was enforced for a little less than three-quarters of a year, the collection for stamp taxes under Schedules A and B of the law amounted to about \$23,500,000. For the first quarter of this fiscal year those stamp taxes amounted to about \$8,500,000, a little more than the amount that it is proposed shall be appropriated for the construction of roads.

I am not willing that the General Government shall levy special taxes in order to go into the business of providing roads. If we can raise the money, as we frequently have been able to, and probably will be able to in the future, in the general course of our revenue laws, and have a surplus which we can devote to the construction of roads, well and good. I do not vote against the bill because my own locality will not receive direct benefit from it, but for the reason that I doubt whether the country, where the money is expended, outside of the cities, is really any more benefited than the cities, where the money is not expended, even if it were for the construction of purely farmers' roads. The cities are prosperous only when the farmers are prosperous; the cities will do well and the men who live in the cities make money only when the country is prosperous and when those who raise the produce on the farms are prosperous. But I am not willing to levy special taxes against the cities in an odious form, such as the stamp taxes are, for the purpose of spending money which is not required for immediate expenditure, either in the cities or in the country.

I am not sure that the statement which I make will not bring adherents to the bill. I notice that the taxes collected under Schedules A and B of the emergency-revenue act, which is for documentary stamps, stamps on perfumery, cosmetics, and so forth, for the last fiscal year in the State of Alabama were \$183,000; in the State of Arkansas, \$117,000; in the first district of Illinois, which is Chicago, \$2,480,000; in the State of Florida, \$140,000; in the third Massachusetts, which is Boston, \$1,004,000; in the second New York district, which is New York City, \$4,354,000; in the first Pennsylvania, which is Philadelphia, \$809,000; in South Carolina, \$100,000; in Washington, \$174,000; in North and South Dakota combined, \$223,000. And I might go on with the list. These special taxes which we have levied are paid by a few cities as stamp taxes—an odious form of taxation at best. I am not undertaking to criticize the necessity of levying this tax at this time, but it is an odious form of taxation at the best, which weighs very heavily upon those who pay it, and which in most instances can not be passed on or divided up among the people generally.

Now, the Members of Congress from those parts of the country where these taxes are very small are in a vast majority in this House. They have the power, and they are about to exercise it, to take this money which they have levied upon the cities in an odious form and expend it in their own States and in their own communities. In the long run that method of raising revenue and expending money will not be a success. You levy the general taxes throughout the country on any proposition; the cities, in the first instance, pay the most of it. They do not complain. They understand the situation. Where the wealth is mostly gathered, there taxation necessarily will be, and must be, the heaviest. They do not complain when you take the money raised in the form of general taxation and expend it in particular localities where it may be of benefit, especially to the locality, and indirectly to the mass of citizenship throughout the Union. But they will have the right to complain when you tax special industries by stamp taxes for the purpose of raising money to be expended in particular localities, and so long as we have the stamp tax in effect, bearing heavily, a burden upon a few people, I am unwilling to take that money and vote it for the benefit of perhaps a majority in particular localities.

I know that probably that statement will only add to the votes for the bill, because it is very natural, though somewhat regrettable, that Members of Congress, human as they are,

are more prone to vote for money to be expended in their district which they know their districts do not raise in the form of revenue. And yet the Government must always in the long run be fair to all. I do not think there is that necessity for this legislation at this time to justify the Government inaugurating a system of spending money for local improvements, and raising that money by an odious form of stamp taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I have always been for good roads. Away back in 1904 it was my pleasure to vote in the Legislature of Maryland for the construction of one of the earliest and best roads in this section, that leading from Washington to Baltimore.

In 1906 we established a system of good roads, and since that time we have constructed in Maryland roads costing more than \$15,000,000. Every section of our State is connected with every other section by trunk-line roads, and they are of great benefit not only to the cities but to the various sections of the State.

I come from a district entirely within the city of Baltimore, but I have never yet heard one of our people complain about the expenditure of money upon good roads in the State of Maryland. It has brought to us prosperity, it has brought close to the city of Baltimore every section of the State from the Potomac River to the Pennsylvania line, from the shores of the great Atlantic Ocean to the Alleghany Mountains, so that every section is connected by easy roads, and the farmers are using them to a great extent in bringing their goods to the markets of Baltimore.

I believe that whatever makes the counties of the State prosperous is bound to make the cities with which they trade likewise both prosperous and progressive, and upon that theory we have gone ahead in the construction of good roads throughout the State of Maryland.

We have a secondary system, which reaches the small road, or the road leading to the farmer's home. Under that system the counties are able to contribute one-half and the State the other half. By those two methods the State of Maryland has acquired a road system second to none in the United States, and we believe every dollar expended has been well expended; that it has brought great revenue to the State; that the properties along those roads have increased wonderfully in value; that the people from the towns and cities are going into the country, living on these highways, where they can easily reach the city of Baltimore or the other sections of the State to which they desire to go.

So I say I have always been in favor of good roads, though I represent an entirely city district. I believe no money the Government can expend can be better expended than upon the public highways of this great country. We ought not to consider whether we live in a particular city or a particular State, but whatever is beneficial to the great mass of the people of this country is bound to be beneficial to each and every section of the country. [Applause.]

When you realize that there are about 6,500,000 farmers in the United States and, including women and children, about 45,000,000 depending upon them, we can readily see the importance of such a bill as this to that vast population of the United States.

It costs 25 cents per ton-mile to transport farm products to the market in the United States where the roads are bad, while in continental Europe, where they have good roads, it costs but 8 cents per ton-mile, a loss to the farmer and his family of 17 cents per ton-mile.

The railroads of our country carry each year some 900,000,000 tons of freight, about 200,000,000 tons of which is transported over the country roads to the markets, wharves, or stations by the farmers, from which it can readily be seen the enormous loss to the farming population of the country by reason of the bad roads which we now have.

I can not better express my position upon the importance of good roads than to recite the facts I gave to this House two years ago upon a similar bill:

I have seen farmers haul their products to market on both pikes and dirt roads. On the average pike one team will haul from one and a half to two tons, make an average trip of 20 miles, and return in one day. On the dirt roads one team will haul, on an average, from one-half to three-fourths of a ton, make an average trip of 10 miles, and return in one day. Therefore, on this calculation, which is a fair one, it costs the

man on the dirt road four times what it costs the man on the pike to market his products, which is conclusive proof that the mud tax is the greatest, most excessive, and most burdensome tax that the farmer pays, and as it is a well-known fact that the ultimate consumer bears all the burden this mud tax must eventually be paid by him. So in view of the fact that the life of the Nation is dependent upon the success of the farm, will any man contend that it is not economical and profitable for the Government to expend money in the construction and maintenance of roads into and through the farming sections? The man who would make such contention is ignorant of the interest the city has, or should have, in the success of the farm.

We have been told that our great cities are merely the product of our agricultural resources. The factories change the products of field and forest to articles for the comfort of man. The progress and prosperity of our land stand upon the innumerable acres of the Union, and the great farm products produced upon this vast acreage is the great backbone of all common wealth and enterprise. Good roads reduce the cost of transportation from at least 28 cents per ton-mile to 8 cents. The experience has been that where good roads are constructed property is increased in value. The taxable basis of the State is increased, the result being a great benefit to the producer, the miner, and the taxpayer. We can not separate the interests of those of the city who earn their living by labor and manufacture from those of the country who produce the wherewithal upon which they live. We can not improve our roads without lessening the expense of transportation of the farm, and this lessened expense will eventually lessen the cost to the ultimate consumer. So with each and all of us, whether residents of teeming cities or of the country districts, good roads are of inestimable value.

Better roads mean cheaper transportation; cheaper transportation means cheaper foodstuffs and living. The farmer feeds the people. What benefits the farmer benefits those who work in the factory, the shops, the thousands and tens of thousands who live in towns and cities. Why improve the rivers and harbors and not improve the great highways of the land over which must be transported the wheat, the corn, the cotton, the cattle and hogs, and every article we eat and wear? The Government collects its revenue from all of the people and all of the people should receive the same fair consideration in return.

There is also another phase of the subject which I think is of vast importance to the people of our State. That is the "educational benefits" derived from good roads. I have always believed, from the time when I was a public-school teacher in my native State, that better advantages can be obtained by having large graded schools; and by the assistance of good roads we may be able to organize the several public schools into groups and merge these groups into central schools. The good roads will enable us to have well-equipped wagons, or perhaps motor vehicles, by which to convey the children from their several sections to the central school. In this way the country people will get the same advantages as those the city now enjoy. This system would insure the regular attendance of the children and their continued interest in the school and would, no doubt, prove a marvelous success in their education. I believe that the education of the children of the country districts is just as important to the people of Baltimore and other large cities as any other one thing, because it is a well-known fact that many of the country children become inhabitants of the large cities and take an active part in the general welfare and the industrial pursuits and professions of their adopted home.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons which I have assigned, and many more which could be given in support of this bill had I more time at my disposal, I shall vote for the pending bill for the improvement of the roads of the country, and sincerely hope it may pass the House and the Senate and become one of the great constructive laws of our land.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that no question before the country to-day meets with such universal approval and support as the question of good roads. Especially true in the country districts of the Nation, because it means, perhaps, more to our rural population than others, being isolated in many instances and long distances from the large cities and centers of population. The interest in good roads, however, is not confined to rural communities by any means, for in this day of automobiles and rapid transit the city resident is as vitally interested as any other. I think, then, that the de-

sirability and the need of good roads need hardly be discussed, for it is universally recognized and conceded, the only question being as to who shall build them and the method to be employed in their construction and maintenance. So insistent has the demand become for improved roads that all the States of the Union, with the exception of five, have instituted special highway departments in their State governments, and many of our States have in recent years appropriated vast sums of money for improved roads, and I know that our people are willing to be taxed for these improvements, because they receive, perhaps, more real benefit from them than any other public utility. The time was when it was thought by many to be unconstitutional for the Federal Government to appropriate money for roads in the States, but in this day it is very generally conceded that it may do so without violence to the Constitution.

Congress appropriates money every year to projects more questionable, constitutionally considered. Not being a member of the legal fraternity, I would not presume to discuss this feature of the pending bill; but common sense would dictate that if the Federal Government can establish a post office in a State and a rural mail route from that post office, or contract for the carrying of the mails by star route from given points in a State, it may with equal propriety contribute to the building and maintenance of roads over which the mails are carried. I agree fully with the report of the committee that—

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for the people.

I also believe jurisdiction over the roads should belong to the State and should never be undertaken by the General Government.

The delivery of mail is a function of the Federal Government, and a road over which the mail is carried is just as much a postal facility as is the post office where the mail is distributed or the carrier on the route. An adequate office outfit, a competent carrier, and a good road contribute alike to the proper and quick dispatch of the mail; hence a contribution by the General Government to the States for the betterment of the road over which it exercises the postal functions should not be considered radical but an aid in the service it is attempting to render the public. The General Government renders aid to State institutions of learning where military training is given for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of our military service. It likewise extends aid to agricultural colleges in the States where military training is given in order to increase the efficiency of our educated farmers. It spends vast sums on rivers and harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation and in order that our Navy may better protect us. We appropriate millions of dollars annually for public buildings in order that the people's businesses may be expedited. If, then, we can appropriate such vast sums for these purposes, some of which only a part of the people are interested in, why should we not appropriate money for roads in which all the people are interested? If deepening a waterway is a saving to the public in freight rates and an aid in transportation, why is not the building of a road, which likewise is an aid to transportation and a cheapening of rates, also a public benefit worthy of Government aid? Our Government has expended millions of dollars in building post-office buildings in our large towns and cities. Why should we not spend millions more in building post roads? The reason for both expenditures would be the same, namely, the efficiency of the Postal Service.

But some gentlemen have objected to governmental aid because it is proposed to appropriate money without assuming jurisdiction, as is exercised in some of the appropriations I have mentioned. But that need not disturb us, for we are in part only reimbursing the State for some of the money it has expended in building roads which we are using in common with them for increasing the efficiency of the Postal Service. We do not need jurisdiction, as we demand in many other things, because we contribute only a part, and our contribution is made to an organized department of a State government having as much or more invested than we have and made under such restrictions as precludes the possibility of governmental waste.

The maximum amount that may be appropriated under this bill is twenty-five millions annually, certainly not a large amount for an object so worthy, when compared with appropriations for purposes less meritorious and with propositions which do not begin to compare in public benefit. As to the equity in allotment to the several States there is great diversity of opinion. I do not suppose it is perfect in its application. It would be beyond the possibilities of human wisdom to draft a measure that would be considered entirely equitable, but I believe the committee has come as near as it is possible at this time. This

is a great country of ours, made up of a Union of great States, some of them large in area but comparatively small in population, some small in area and large in population, but all great, whether large or small. Our interests are diversified. Our conditions are different. Some States have large cities, some are almost rural. Some present difficulties of one kind in road building, some another, so that a bill which would be absolutely equitable and free of arbitrary features would be impossible of preparation. But I believe the committee has done well. There are three methods of allotment to the States, first, an arbitrary amount of \$65,000 is given to each State, large or small, and one-half the remainder to be apportioned in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and the other half in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star routes bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States. I do not know whether a more equitable plan could be evolved or not, anyway none has been proposed, and I will say this, that I am in favor of this bill, but if some gentleman who is opposing this measure will propose a better plan I will be glad to help adopt it. I am not wedded to the letter of this bill, but I am in hearty accord with the spirit of it. Until a better plan is suggested I shall stand by this. This bill is of so much importance to all the American people that we should not haggle about and split hairs over entire equity. The belief that some States will get a few thousand more and some a few thousand less than they are entitled to should not jeopardize the passage of a bill so far-reaching and beneficial. It is seldom that we have the opportunity to pass legislation so universally helpful as this bill will prove to be. There should be no sectionalism because all sections are helped. There should be no city against country, because you can not benefit the farmer without benefiting the city man as well.

In the State of Maryland, which I have the honor in part to represent, we have been operating under a law similar to this for many years. The State gives aid to the counties under certain conditions, and it has stimulated road building as nothing had done before, resulting finally in the bonding of our State and constructing a complete system of State highways. Although a small State we have spent over \$16,000,000 in the last seven years and have some of the best roads in the Union. All of this was the result of the impetus given road improvement by the passage of the State aid law, whereby the State contributed 50 per cent to the counties. The law is still in effect, and at the last legislature the appropriation was increased from two to three hundred thousand dollars annually. While the State has constructed outright the intercounty system of 1,300 miles, the counties are constructing with State aid the lateral roads leading from the State highway into the surrounding country. It has been argued here that this bill, if enacted into law, would stagnate road building and place a premium upon inactivity. My experience teaches me otherwise, and it is my earnest conviction that if you pass this bill and make it a law you will have placed a stimulus before the American States for road construction they have never before possessed. During the passage of our road legislation through the various legislative sessions in Maryland we were confronted with the same issues that confront us here. The great city of Baltimore, our only large city, felt they were being called upon to pay more than her share of the cost of our State roads, but I venture to say that to-day there is not a handful of her citizens that regret contributing to the construction of a great State system of roads; the city has reaped her share of the benefits. In the last analysis all roads lead to the great cities and centers of population, and the interests and destinies of all our people are so interwoven, whether city or country, that all are equally benefitted.

Another argument made against this bill is that on account of special appropriations for national defense which this Congress is called upon to provide we can not afford to embark on road improvement. Why, it is a part of national defense! What better investment can we make than in spending a few millions to improve our roads for military movements? Of what use would a vast army be, no matter how well trained and disciplined, unless they could be quickly moved to the field of battle? It would be far more sensible, as a matter of defense and preparedness, to have a few less regiments of soldiers and better roads over which to move the remainder.

Another objection urged against this bill is the broad powers given the Secretary of Agriculture in administration, but I believe a close study of its provisions, taking into consideration the ends to be attained, will convince most of us that they are not dangerous powers, but wise provisions. For instance, he may in his discretion contribute on the part of the Government not less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of the reasonable cost

of such construction or maintenance. I admit these are broad powers for Congress to invest in an administrative office, but the peculiarity of the project, I believe, makes it a necessity. Conditions in one State might make it desirable to construct more miles of road with Government aid than in some other State, in which case 30 per cent could be furnished, while the State in which conditions warranted the building of less miles could be allotted 40 or 50 per cent. I believe if you take into consideration the advanced position of some States over others in road construction as well as the geographical conditions and the geological conditions of the various States we must conclude this is a wise if not a necessary provision. It is possible, of course, to abuse this power; but what power of administration is not susceptible of abuse? As for myself, I have no fear on that score either from the present incumbent or his successors. Another thing that must be borne in mind is that while the percentage may vary, the allotment to the several States may not be changed, so that a State will be sure of its allotment being expended either with a greater or less amount of its own funds. The third purpose for which it is conceded the Federal Government may aid the construction of roads is where the roads are used in the transportation of interstate commerce. The question of transportation in a vast country like ours is second to none, and the ease with which it is consummated and the lowest cost of service are vital questions. The great difference in the cost of transportation between the farm and the railroad with improved roads is apparent to all, when we consider the figures in connection with it. It has been estimated that it costs the farmer 25 to 30 cents per ton per mile to haul his products to the railroad, while the railroad company takes it to the city market, 150 miles distant, for one-half cent per ton per mile. Much criticism has been leveled at the railroads of the country in recent years, some of it deserved, but with such figures as these before us it is difficult to charge much of the high cost of living to the railroads. In the question of transportation alone the investment this country would make by this bill would be more than justified, and the millions thus spent would flow back into the pockets of the people manifold. By this saving in transportation that I have indicated every man, woman, and child in the Union is affected.

France has the greatest road system of any nation in the world, having nearly a half million miles of macadam roads, constructed in part by national aid, and the products of factory and farm are carried to the markets for less than 10 cents per ton per mile, as against about 30 in the United States. Do you comprehend what a vast saving that would be to our people? Is it not easy to see what a factor that would be in reducing the cost of living in this country? It would benefit all classes—the laborer, the mechanic, the banker, the merchant, and the farmer. The farmers of the Nation are more vitally interested, perhaps, than any other, because it means more in the way of conveniences. It makes life on the farm attractive; it increases the use of automobiles by the farmers; it keeps the boys and girls on the farms, which are the great feeders of the Nation. The farm is the source of our national wealth, the foundation of civilized society, the best home of the family; it is the recruiting ground for our cities, and it is from the farmers that the great men in commerce and finance are recruited and from whence reinforcements come to replenish the forces in public life in both State and Nation. This is neither a sectional nor partisan measure, but should be met in a patriotic spirit.

The American people are as a rule patriots first, partisans second, and I believe all that is necessary to the passage of this legislation is that a clear understanding be gained as to the untold and undreamed of possibilities. I will give you an illustration from my own State: Our State road project was begun under a Democratic governor, a Democratic legislature, and a Democratic roads commission. In the midst of it, and after we were fairly started and had spent six millions, we were so unfortunate as to elect a Republican governor, who, in turn, appointed a Republican roads commission, but the legislature remained strongly Democratic. Many feared that party conflict and a divided responsibility would prove disastrous to our State road system, but there seemed a determination that party politics and jealousies should have no place in this matter. Accordingly, we find a Democratic legislature appropriating in two sessions over \$10,000,000 to complete the roads, and we find the Republican road commission vying with the Democrats by spending it judiciously and expeditiously. I commend that spirit to the Members of this House. Let us rise to the occasion, brushing aside all speciousness, and give this great people whom we represent their hearts' desire. If we think we can not afford it, let us cut off something else and make ourselves afford it. If you think some particular State is to get

ten thousand more than it should, forget it, and try to remember that we can not benefit any State or section without benefiting every other State and section of our common country. We are Americans, and we are here to legislate for all the American people. Let us aid in the construction of a great system of roads that shall reach from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf. Establish a public utility that is desired and used by all the people all the time. The automobile on pleasure and recreation bent wants improved roads, and as he traverses this country and sees its greatness his love for it is bound to increase. The commerce will be carried over them with immense profit and benefit. The artisan and the laborer, with their dinner pails hung to the handle bars of a bicycle, will rejoice and bless the country in which they live. The farmer and his family will be more prosperous and happy, and the Government, which has made a comparatively small contribution, will move its troops quickly, deliver the mails with greater expedition, and see the products of the farm placed at the door of the consumer at a reduced cost. Are not all these desirable ends worth striving for; and that such results will be attained is, I believe, the opinion of the great mass of the American people.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is unduly alarmed, I am sure, if he is under the impression, as he seems to be, that the rural sections of the country, or the farmers, as he puts it, are going to have an advantage in this bill over the cities. There is a general demand for good roads, and my observation has been that the greatest demand for road development comes largely from the city centers, in order that the cities might be brought more closely in touch with the rural sections.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], one of the ablest Members of this House, together with other distinguished gentlemen, have seen fit to criticize this bill. Admitting that it is not all that some of us would like, for I would like to see a bill carrying a larger appropriation for the purpose of road construction, yet it is the plan the committee has agreed upon, and it is the only plan now before Congress and I am heartily in favor of it.

On December 7, 1915, in the opening days of the present Congress, I introduced a bill having as its purpose governmental aid to road construction, which bill is No. 3060, and was referred to the Committee on Roads. That in a large measure expressed my idea of how the Government should contribute toward this important development. The present bill in some respects has provisions similar to those contained in my bill, but in other respects it is dissimilar. I shall not stop now to read my bill, as it is not under consideration, but I shall discuss the Shackelford bill, which is now under consideration.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

Some gentlemen have opposed and are opposing the idea of Government aid to road building upon the ground that it is not constitutional. There can be but little doubt in the mind of any one well versed upon the questions of constitutional law as to this issue. It is now pretty well and generally conceded that the General Government has the constitutional right to construct and maintain post roads, military roads, and roads used for interstate commerce. As has been so aptly said by the committee:

On the general principle that the greater contains the lesser, it follows that the General Government may aid the States in the construction and maintenance of such roads.

And that is exactly what the Shackelford bill seeks to do.

OTHER QUESTIONS.

With the constitutional question out of the way, what other opposition have we? It has been urged from certain quarters that this would build roads in the country counties largely at the expense of the great cities, and that the cities pay the larger part of the revenues into the Treasury of the United States. Cities are built, as will be admitted by all, at the expense of the rural sections; and, furthermore, good roads would benefit everybody alike, and would help in bringing the people of the rural sections into closer touch and fellowship with their city brethren, and would prove of inestimable value to farmers and city people alike. It is a narrow policy to argue that money appropriated under this bill would benefit the farming population to the disadvantage of the city population. As I have already said, in my section the people in the cities are eager for better roads that they may be brought more closely in fellowship, commercially, socially, and otherwise, with the people on the farms and with many good towns scattered through the rural sections. The people of the cities are more able and I may add,

in my opinion, are willing to bear the greater burden of the expense in order that this great work might be advanced, and in order that the whole country might be bound together in closer bonds of union by means of a network of improved roads.

In many sections of the country there are small counties, with limited population and limited means, which are not able to improve and maintain their roads, and yet there can be no system of good roads until they are linked and connected from one county to another; nor can the farmers or people generally get the best use of the roads until the highways of the country are generally improved. If roads are constructed for use of the farmers and if they are good roads, they may be used for any and every other purpose; while on the other hand, if they are constructed for automobiles and are good roads, it naturally follows that the farmers will get the use of them for their various purposes. What the people want are good roads for all purposes, and they want them, as this bill fixes it, under State control.

FEDERAL AID.

I am no new convert to the idea of Federal aid to road construction and road maintenance. I have advocated it for years, in fact, before I began my service in Congress, and voted for and advocated Federal aid to road building when the question was before Congress in the last term. The House, as it will be recalled, passed a bill giving Federal aid to road construction and it was killed in the Senate, and did not, for that reason, become a law. Roads are local in their nature yet national in their importance, if they are improved roads; and national in their detriment to the general good if they are not improved. Primarily it should be the duty of the States to build and maintain the roads, but whose function is it to operate and maintain the mail facilities of the country? All admit that the latter is the function of the National Government; that being true, it is proper that the General Government should provide itself with adequate facilities with which to perform this important duty. The General Government provides other necessities along this line for adequate mail facilities, such as postmasters, post offices, and so forth, so why not post roads? It also pays heavily for rental or carrying when the mails are conveyed over railroads; why not pay for carrying mails over State roads or help build and maintain those roads? A post road is as much a postal facility as is a mail car or a post office. In many sections post-office buildings are rented instead of owned by the General Government, as it is economy to rent rather than build them in thinly settled sections. The theory is identical—why not the Government pay a reasonable rental for the use of its mail roads, which will go to the construction and upkeep of these and other roads so used by the Government, which would be less expensive than if the Government constructed the roads in the first instance.

In times gone by, I hope never to return, the volume and weight of postal matter were of slight consequence in rural sections. To-day it is considerable in all parts of the country and particularly in the more progressive sections. Formerly the interest of the General Government in the condition of the roads was not very great for the reasons stated, but with the establishment of the Rural Free Delivery Service came also the necessity for better roads over which to transport and deliver the mails. With the Post Office Department's progressive idea of motorizing the rural service came a further demand for still better roads.

In the first place a community can not have the very best possible mail service even with a horse-drawn vehicle equipment unless the roads are fairly improved. The Government will not establish, nor attempt to establish, a rural route unless the roads are passable and unless it is evident that the mails can be delivered over them. Now, under the new or progressive idea originated by the present administration of affairs in the department, a motor route will not be established unless the roads are sufficiently improved for the use of automobiles. With the rapidly expanding Parcel Post System came a further demand for better service, and to get better service there is a general interest in and a demand for better roads. As a result of the demand of the people for efficient mail service on the rural routes and with the Government's faith pledged to better mail service, its interest in good roads has grown accordingly and to-day is a matter of large concern to the Government.

STATE CONTROL.

In the bill providing for Government aid, introduced by me, it is provided that the States shall exercise control over the roads, even though built or maintained by the General Government. This is upon the theory that roads are primarily local concerns over which the respective States exercise control, and that control should not be disturbed by the General Government.

WHAT THE STATES WILL RECEIVE.

This bill in many particulars is the same as the bill we had up and passed in the House in the Sixty-third Congress; and

the maximum amount which may be appropriated for any fiscal year under this act is \$25,000,000, which would be prorated to each of the several States, as follows:

State.	Population.			Rural free delivery.		Star routes.		Per cent of total miles of R. F. D. and star routes.	Amount.	Specific amount.	Total amount of aid to each State.
	Population.	Per cent of total population.	Amount.	Number of routes.	Aggregate length of routes.	Number of routes.	Aggregate length of routes.				
					Miles.		Miles.				
Alabama.....	2,138,093	2.34	\$255,996	1,065	25,845	251	2,589.09	2.36	\$258,184	\$65,000	\$579,180
Arizona.....	240,354	.22	24,068	28	677	88	2,391.73	.26	28,444	65,000	117,512
Arkansas.....	1,574,449	1.72	188,168	553	13,366	520	6,099.38	1.62	177,228	65,000	430,396
California.....	2,377,549	2.60	284,440	408	9,553	396	7,564.85	1.42	155,348	65,000	504,788
Colorado.....	799,024	.87	95,178	207	5,472	271	4,724.00	.85	92,990	65,000	253,168
Connecticut.....	1,114,756	1.22	133,468	281	6,219	65	359.06	.55	60,170	65,000	258,638
Delaware.....	202,322	.22	24,068	58	1,509	12	58.71	.13	14,222	65,000	103,290
Florida.....	752,619	.82	89,708	233	5,546	176	1,716.59	.60	65,640	65,000	230,348
Georgia.....	2,609,121	2.85	311,790	1,493	36,610	145	1,381.43	3.16	345,704	65,000	722,494
Idaho.....	325,594	.36	39,384	162	4,061	185	3,161.62	.60	65,640	65,000	170,024
Illinois.....	5,638,591	6.16	673,904	2,844	68,979	80	717.77	5.79	633,426	65,000	1,372,339
Indiana.....	2,700,876	2.94	321,636	2,072	50,774	90	733.88	4.28	468,232	65,000	854,868
Iowa.....	2,224,721	2.42	264,748	2,116	55,929	86	275.73	4.68	511,992	65,000	841,740
Kansas.....	1,690,949	1.84	201,296	1,859	50,838	123	2,058.30	4.40	481,360	65,000	747,656
Kentucky.....	2,289,905	2.50	273,500	800	18,765	786	7,843.45	2.21	241,774	65,000	580,274
Louisiana.....	1,656,388	1.81	198,614	275	6,504	283	2,492.44	.75	82,050	65,000	345,064
Maine.....	742,371	.81	88,614	478	10,970	288	2,561.62	1.12	122,528	65,000	276,142
Maryland.....	1,295,346	1.41	154,254	422	9,698	156	1,210.58	.91	99,554	65,000	318,808
Massachusetts.....	3,366,416	3.67	401,458	278	6,084	140	862.60	.63	68,922	65,000	535,422
Michigan.....	2,810,173	3.06	334,764	1,759	48,046	150	1,551.58	4.12	450,728	65,000	880,492
Minnesota.....	2,075,708	2.27	248,338	1,581	49,676	190	2,560.63	3.84	420,096	65,000	733,434
Mississippi.....	1,797,114	1.96	214,424	884	21,512	236	2,462.41	1.99	217,706	65,000	497,110
Missouri.....	3,238,335	3.59	392,746	2,166	51,455	452	5,310.99	4.72	516,368	65,000	974,114
Montana.....	376,053	.41	44,854	94	2,506	202	6,541.00	.76	85,144	65,000	192,998
Nebraska.....	1,192,214	1.30	142,220	1,086	29,233	211	4,554.27	2.81	307,414	65,000	514,684
Nevada.....	81,875	.09	9,846	4	85	81	2,807.60	.24	26,256	65,000	101,102
New Hampshire.....	403,572	.47	51,418	246	5,564	122	902.47	.54	59,076	65,000	175,494
New Jersey.....	2,537,167	2.77	303,038	311	7,149	110	553.09	.64	70,016	65,000	438,054
New Mexico.....	327,301	.36	39,384	162	4,061	218	4,860.61	.47	51,418	65,000	158,832
New York.....	9,113,614	9.94	1,087,436	1,949	44,970	486	3,648.97	4.04	441,976	65,000	1,594,412
North Carolina.....	2,206,287	2.41	263,654	1,378	31,961	396	4,042.54	2.99	327,106	65,000	655,763
North Dakota.....	577,056	.63	68,922	680	18,401	163	2,608.55	1.75	191,450	65,000	323,372
Ohio.....	4,767,121	5.21	569,974	2,545	60,974	149	1,041.16	5.15	563,410	65,000	1,198,384
Oklahoma.....	1,657,155	1.81	198,014	957	25,504	288	4,125.00	2.46	269,124	65,000	532,138
Oregon.....	672,765	.73	79,862	253	6,187	248	5,294.43	.95	103,930	65,000	248,792
Pennsylvania.....	7,655,111	8.36	914,384	1,906	49,963	562	3,062.82	4.48	490,112	65,000	1,469,696
Rhode Island.....	542,610	.59	64,546	49	896	18	87.61	.09	9,846	65,000	139,392
South Carolina.....	1,515,400	1.65	180,510	860	20,420	114	1,177.96	1.80	196,920	65,000	442,430
South Dakota.....	583,888	.64	70,016	621	18,271	190	4,021.74	1.85	202,390	65,000	337,406
Tennessee.....	2,184,789	2.38	260,372	1,611	38,313	207	2,276.41	3.37	368,678	65,000	694,030
Texas.....	3,896,542	4.25	464,950	2,019	49,251	628	10,179.40	4.94	540,436	65,000	1,070,386
Utah.....	373,351	.41	44,854	55	1,235	113	2,541.11	.31	33,914	65,000	143,768
Vermont.....	355,956	.39	42,666	343	7,610	137	1,166.77	.73	79,862	65,000	157,523
Virginia.....	2,061,612	2.25	246,150	1,101	24,557	626	6,295.00	2.56	280,064	65,000	591,214
Washington.....	1,141,990	1.25	136,755	349	8,539	173	2,450.77	.91	99,554	65,000	301,304
West Virginia.....	1,221,119	1.33	145,502	420	9,403	475	4,946.22	1.19	130,186	65,000	340,688
Wisconsin.....	2,333,860	2.55	278,970	1,691	41,717	145	1,510.27	3.59	392,746	65,000	736,716
Wyoming.....	145,965	.16	17,504	21	592	157	4,137.03	.39	42,666	65,000	125,170
Total.....	91,641,197	100	10,940,000	42,567	1,056,897	11,430	147,365.50	100	10,940,000	3,120,000	25,000,000

PREPAREDNESS.

We have heard and read a great deal lately on the question of preparedness, and we are told that it is vital to the Nation's safety. I agree that a reasonable and conservative amount of preparedness for an adequate and safe defense should be provided for; but for the life of me I can not see a better plan of preparedness than to improve our highways, both the roads and the waterways. They are both essential to prosperity and to the more substantial development of our great common country. If we would have the sinews of war for defensive purposes, we must keep our country prosperous. To make it prosperous we must aid in its development agriculturally and otherwise, so that the markets of this country and of the world will be open to our products and commerce. Beyond question, prices are most largely controlled by the laws of supply and demand. Unless there are markets there can be no demand, and unless we open up the ways leading to those markets, whether by highways or waterways, the demand may exist, but we can not supply it. This is a great, rich, powerful country. To develop its highways and waterways will not cost a great deal; no one man will ever feel the cost of constructing good roads, and the benefits to the people generally will be simply beyond measure.

I made an address in the last Congress in support of the policy of committing the National Government to aid in road construction and road maintenance, and my position on the subject is well known to every Member of this House and to the country, so I shall not take up much more of your time.

WHAT GEORGIA WOULD GET.

It will be seen from the table I referred to a while ago that the amount coming to Georgia under this bill would be considerable, amounting to \$722,494, upon the basis fixed in the table upon which it has been computed. It will be observed that few States of the Union would profit much more largely than would

my State. It would mean much to our State if this amount could be added annually to what Georgia is spending and would be of vast assistance in the construction and maintenance of our roads. It would lighten the burdens on Georgia taxpayers to a very great extent and would rapidly help in the completion of a splendid system of highways in our State for the general use of the public. It means a great deal to Georgia and to Georgians.

I hope to see the time when all of Georgia's roads will be improved, so that our farm products and commerce can be hauled and handled at less cost and so that our people from one end of the State to the other will be brought closely together by a network of good roads constructed with Federal aid. No greater work can be undertaken by the General Government; and what it means to Georgia it means to every other Southern State and to practically every other State of the Nation.

The complaint that the expense falls too heavily on the great cities like Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago is not well founded. These are great cities and the country is proud of them; we are all proud of their achievements; but let me assure you that each of the great cities of the country will be correspondingly benefited as the farmers of the country are given better roads. The farmers of the country have contributed all these years to the building of these great American cities, now why not the great cities bear their part of the burden in giving to the farmers of the country a network of improved roads? We must not think of our country as one of sections nor as one of cities and rural sections; we must think of it as one great whole. The interests of the country is so closely interwoven with the interests of the city that they are practically one and the same. It has been said:

Destroy your cities and they will be rebuilt and prosper again, but destroy the farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land.

When you help the agricultural sections of this country, you help every interest in the country. There should not be a dissenting vote against this bill, and I hope it will soon become a law, and that the hope of the people for good roads upon a large and useful scale will soon be realized. It is a question that is close to the heart of the great American people, and they are looking to their friends in Congress to-day to support this bill, which is one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation that has been considered in this House in many a day or will likely be in many a day.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short article from the Ocala Banner, published in my district on January 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the article referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the value and importance of good roads as measured by the benefits they confer on all classes of our people, irrespective of their callings or residence, are now so academic and well understood as to render further discussion unnecessary, either to inform or to arouse interest in this great forward and progressive movement.

This Congress more than two years ago recognized the widespread demand for national aid in road building and appointed a committee to thoroughly study the question and to frame a bill for such purpose. The courteous and helpful answers of members of this committee in response to the numerous questions propounded during this discussion show convincingly that they have thoroughly studied the question from every viewpoint and have prepared a bill with an eye single to the common good and one free from all suspicion of partisanship, sectionalism, or selfish greed.

I believe that the passage of this bill will directly benefit more people in every State and in every section of our country than any other one single measure that this or any previous Congress has passed. [Applause.]

The suggestion has been made by one gentleman that this bill is perhaps not as good as the one drafted by this same committee at a previous session, but in such suggestion but few on this floor concur, and the Senate has already repudiated the former bill. It has even been asserted by some of the opponents of this measure that it should be labeled "A bill to provide funds for auto highways." No arguments or facts are advanced in support of such assertion, and I am free to say that if the Members of this House who are supporting this bill believed for a moment that such was its purpose or would be its effect, it would be defeated by an overwhelming vote.

The views on this subject of the distinguished chairman of the committee who drafted and reported the bill, as well as the views of many of his associates on the committee, especially the learned gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], are so well known to the Members of the House and to the public at large as to thoroughly and satisfactorily answer such a suggestion and insinuation. [Applause.]

The very language of the bill controverts it, for, as stated before, the declared primary purpose of this bill is not to construct or maintain good roads from one city to another, nor from one railroad center to another, nor from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, nor from ocean to ocean, but it is to build and maintain a system of roads over which the mail and parcel-post business of this Government can be carried from the local distributing centers in the several States out into the country districts. It is true, however, that when the system of roads contemplated and provided for in this bill is finally completed, that we will have through the connection and meeting of the independent segments that will be constructed at first out from cities and towns a united system of roads interlacing and connecting all the different sections of our country. This, though, must be considered as a secondary or postponed result of the system that we are now inaugurating.

The very fact that the bill provides that the funds to be appropriated shall be disbursed by and under the direction of the head of the Agricultural Department of the Nation is a further assurance that the money will be expended in a way that will best conserve and promote the interest of our great rural districts. This department is appreciative of the fact that good roads are absolutely essential to the furtherance and carrying out of every plan looking to the development, welfare, and growth of the all-important farming interests of our country. This department fully realizes that the men and women who

toil with their hands close to old Mother Earth are the chief, yea, the real, wealth makers of this Nation, and that the entire Nation is vitally interested in the perfecting and carrying out of plans that will make farm life attractive, remunerative, and socially satisfying. When our rural life is not as wholesome and not as satisfying as it might be, the whole Nation at large is the loser. [Applause.]

If this Congress can lend its aid in building good roads to the homes of our farmers and will provide at this session a practical rural-credit system, such as has been outlined in what is known as the Bulkley bill, we will have done much for the internal upbuilding of our entire country, and future generations, as well as the present, will be the beneficiaries of this wise and much-needed legislation. Surely we will not distrust the head of our Agricultural Department in the matter of wisely expending, solely in the interest of the farmers, the funds that this bill serves to place at his disposal. As to how well he uses the talents now placed with him will depend all future grants.

In desperation some few who dwell in large cities and are opposed to bills looking to the aid of farmers have suggested that Congress is without power, under the Constitution, to make an appropriation for this purpose, but no one has, and I venture to assert no one can, seriously argue or maintain such position. The bill primarily proposes to aid in the construction and maintenance of a general system of roads leading out from towns, cities, and railroad centers, over which the rapidly increasing business of the Post Office Department can be carried and handled with economy and dispatch. All must admit that when such primary purpose is taken into account these highways lose their local character and become great public and national utilities [applause], over which every day there is and will be transported vast volumes of not only intrastate but also interstate business.

If it be right to appropriate large sums of money to purchase sites and erect thereon magnificent buildings in cities and towns for the prompt and efficient handling of city mail, then it must of necessity follow that it is lawful to use national funds to aid in the building and maintaining of good permanent roads over which the Government can carry on with economy and dispatch its equally important business with the men out on the farms. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

[Mr. WEBB addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will now ask the gentleman from New York to use some of his time.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the Sixty-third Congress I regret to state that I voted for the Shackleford roads bill. I was one of those to whom the molasses in the form of an allotment to the State of Massachusetts was of sufficient attraction to catch the fly in the shape of my vote. I am glad to say to-day that I have gotten loose from the molasses and shall act upon this bill upon its merits. Such being the case, I shall record my vote against it.

The report submitted by the committee condemns the bill. Under the heading of "Federal participation" we find it states, "roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of States to provide them for their people." At the beginning of the very next paragraph, in order to be sure that we do not forget the previous paragraph, it states:

Primarily roads are local concerns, and jurisdiction over them belong to the States and local authorities, which jurisdiction should not be disturbed by the General Government.

I accept the statement of the majority of the committee as the best evidence against the bill. The roads are primarily local concerns, and should be provided by the States and jurisdiction over them should be controlled by the States or the local community. It seems to me we can make no stronger argument against the bill than the committee itself does in its own report. It distinctly states that roads are local in their nature, and it further puts a duty and obligation upon the State to construct them.

Then, again, it admits that no supervision or control of the highway should pass out of the State or local authorities. In other words, this report says that simply because you and I do not do our duty as men and citizens, it is incumbent upon our brother to perform that duty for us. Where is the logic and sense of any such statement as that? It is, however, exactly what the Shackleford report says upon the question of Federal aid to roads.

It says distinctly that it is incumbent upon the State or local community to pay for its own roads for the benefit of the community served, but by inference it says that there are some States in this country which so far have been negligent in their duty in this respect. Rather than arouse them to perform that duty, we will allow them to be as negligent as they desire, and reach into Uncle Sam's pocket to build the roads in order that mail may be delivered.

Then, too, the report says that as rural delivery is a factor in postal management it is right that the Government should pay its part of the expense of the use and maintenance of the highway. Mr. Chairman, what would this proportionate part be, based on a rural carrier going over his route of 25 miles once per day? If a road is used at all, the proportionate share of this light vehicle, whether it be manufactured by the angel of peace or the old-fashioned one-hoss shay or a motor cycle, would be so small that even the gentleman from Missouri could not find enough of an apportionment to base any kind of a payment.

It is admitted that the jurisdiction over highways should not be disturbed by the General Government, but, on the other hand, the supporters of this bill are perfectly willing to permit of all possible kinds of payments by the General Government without the least control of what the money is paid for. All the control the Government is to have is the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the specifications are made up in accordance with his views.

That is about as slipshod a business arrangement as I ever knew of even Uncle Sam being willing to participate in. It places in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture as nice a fund for political manipulation as can be possibly established, and opens up a new avenue of political appointment of the highest grade. First we had political places filled by this administration under the collection of the income tax; then another set of officials were established under the Federal reserve; next an additional lot under the war-revenue tax; and now we have a provision that before any of this money is expended the "Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act." Still, in the debate on Friday last, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] praises the Democratic Party for having included this splendid piece of legislation in their platform, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] invited all parties to join together in this "non-partisan" legislation. It probably would be nonpartisan after the Democratic officials deduct all the necessary amounts for defraying the expenses of administration, and then designate what particular friends must be employed in the various States in order to have the specification properly approved.

I appeal to my Republican friends not to be deceived into believing that this is not a nice big slice of Democratic patronage. While I have heard many criticisms on this floor, and a favorite kind of attack in the press, on the river and harbor appropriations, Mr. Chairman, let me remind you that there are six processes of protection to the Treasury before a dollar is ever taken out for rivers and harbors. Here it goes out solely on the say so of the President's political appointee, the Secretary of Agriculture. If river and harbor legislation has in it any slice of "pork," the Shackleford road bill is the whole hog.

I need not refer to the very able argument and splendid speech of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is on the committee. I congratulate him on his clear explanation of the fallacies of this legislation, and, further, I desire to inform the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] that he was mistaken in thinking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] does not know what he is talking about in reference to Massachusetts roads.

We are expending in Massachusetts large sums of money for the construction and maintenance of a highway system, to the use of which we invite the people of the United States. You never have heard of Massachusetts asking the Federal Government for any assistance, nor can you use the molasses of this bill, in the form of an allotment of \$535,000, to catch the fly of the support of the Members from that State to pay into the Federal Treasury several times that amount for the benefit of Democratic officeholders or even for the construction of roads in States which have not done their duty in accordance with the phraseology of the Shackleford report in having provided for roads for the people in their own community.

Let me call the attention of the House to section 5, under which you can build any kind of an old road you wish, whether it is of—

Earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of a higher class, one of the purposes of this act being to en-

courage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into adjacent farming communities.

The committee having stated that it is the duty of the local unit, designated as the State in this bill, to build its own highways, let me remind the friends of this bill that if such roads have not already been constructed leading from the center of population to the farming communities they have neglected their very first duty of construction, because that is exactly the class of road which the local unit should have been anxious to build first. It is true that charity begins at home, and the charity of the State or local community should begin at the depot or post office.

Then, too, the Government will be extremely liberal by the States when it assumes, as it will under section 5, the construction of culverts and bridges. There is no limitation of the size or span that a bridge shall be in order to be constructed by the Federal Government. It is extremely kind of you to allow Massachusetts, New York, and other States we can readily name to have the privilege of paying for the construction of bridges across the wide and tortuous streams of your Southern States. This, however, is a charity never intended for the Federal Government to assume, and it should not be made a part of the law of the land.

The bill is wrong in principle, vicious in its details, and filled with unfair and improper provisions. The condition of our Treasury is such that a special kind of bookkeeping, never before heard of, and which has been thoroughly explained on this floor, is needed in order to show any balance in the Treasury at all. The Shackleford bill appropriates \$25,000,000 annually, performing thereby an arithmetical stunt of taking something from where there is nothing.

The Democratic wise men are scratching their heads and using their gray matter in order to discover some new form of taxation that will rest heavily on New England and lightly on the States where we are to build Federal roads, and if they can find these new methods of taxation, doubtless they will be willing to add this \$25,000,000 in order that one plank of the Baltimore platform may be put into effect rather than broken to shreds, as nearly all of them have been by the present administration. This bill should, therefore, be beaten by the votes of the Members of this House.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary really for me to speak after the very strong statement and argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. No doubt the Government of the United States has the right to spend money upon post roads—I notice that this money is to be spent on any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried, and is rather indefinite—but even when the United States so spends money it is always recognized that the money ought to be returned by the locality. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] wisely pointed out the other day that the great Cumberland Post Road, a road responsible probably for the destruction of more than one administration, was paid for, not by the United States, but by the proceeds of public lands in the Northwest Territory. The great Pacific railroads were paid for by bonds issued by the United States. I think it was intended that the interest should be repaid by the roads, but the principal was repaid by the roads, and all other expenses were paid for by the proceeds of land grants to those railroads, with alternate sections benefited and reserved to the United States. If there is one thing in which a community ought to feel a pride and exercise its power, it is in the roads which it affords to its own people. If there is one thing that can not be safely trusted to a Secretary of Agriculture, maybe 3,000 miles away, it is the way that roads shall be built in your State and built in mine. It is impossible to deal fairly at such a distance. There are no less than three modes of distribution of the money of the Nation indicated in this bill. One part is equally given to each State, whether it contains so many thousands or so many millions of inhabitants. Half of the rest goes in proportion to population, and the other half in proportion to the mileage of rural free delivery roads appearing in the last report of the Postmaster General. Under his discretion to establish these roads this money, as far as half is concerned, can be distributed to what States he chooses, and under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture it can be given to what localities he pleases within those States. Such an appropriation of public money, not by Congress but at the discretion of two Secretaries, is unknown in any bill, be it for public buildings or for rivers and harbors. I have no hesitation in speaking for my own State, because we are proud of what my State has done for good roads. We have been almost first in the United States to construct the best roads to be found any-

where to be used by everyone who travels from New York to Philadelphia, or from Pennsylvania to the seaboard, and we paid for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. DUNN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We paid for them. I dare, therefore, to call attention to the fact that New Jersey, under this bill, is given \$438,000 out of \$25,000,000, according to the calculation at the end of the bill. It is 1.75 per cent, almost exactly. New Jersey's population is 2.75 per cent of the total population of the United States, and hers is not a population of idlers, for, according to the statistics, that State has 2.8 of the total number of people engaged in actual industrial occupations with their hands. She paid in 1914 of the internal-revenue taxes—which are the taxes we are raising now—3.6 per cent of the total amount. If this bill goes into operation, New Jersey will have contributed \$900,000 of the \$25,000,000, and she will get back \$438,000 to be expended—not as she pleases, but as the Secretary of Agriculture shall adjudge. I do not think that this is fair to the people of my State. I do not believe that any other State wishes to take our money, and we do not wish to take theirs in order to do what is for our own local improvement. The greatest thing a State can have is good roads, but they are the possession of the State. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under leave to extend his remarks, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey submitted the following:

New Jersey is glad to take care of her own roads, although in these days those roads are a free contribution to the automobile traffic of the whole Union which often crosses the State without stopping, so that New Jersey people receive no benefit.

If there is anything which ought to be taken care of by the locality, it is the roads, and the locality gets the benefit of those roads.

A strong objection to this bill is that it results in using the taxes collected in one State to pay for roads in other States. New Jersey is an example. The report, on page 6, shows that she would receive \$438,054 out of an appropriation of \$25,000,000, which is as nearly as possible 1½ per cent. The same table shows that her population is 2,537,167 out of a total population of 91,641,197, or over 2½ per cent.

By reference to the Statistical Abstract of 1914, page 235, it appears that she had 1,074,360 persons engaged in gainful occupations out of a total of 38,167,336, or over 2.8 per cent, and from the same table, on page 596, it appears that in 1914, New Jersey paid in internal revenue \$13,829,051.13 out of a total of \$380,800,893.96, or over 3.6 per cent; that is to say, New Jersey contributes a proportion of internal revenue which is over twice as much as she is allowed in this bill. These figures are simply submitted in illustration of one of the considerations so well set forth in the minority views.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, there probably is not in this House a person who is a more enthusiastic exponent of good roads than am I. But inasmuch as I can not see my way clear to favor this measure at this time, I think it is reasonable for me to ask the privilege of stating my reasons.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that the State of New York has not, at the present time, spent all of the hundred millions of dollars appropriated for her good roads, but it is a fact that the balance remaining has been allotted for these highways. We have, probably, as thoroughly an organized highway department, as comprehensive a system of highways, as exists in any other State in the Union. And with all this departmental efficiency, we still have difficulty in distributing this fund to the satisfaction of every person interested in the work.

Considering this fact, with the added burdens which have been put upon us by the Federal Government in the way of taxation, I believe, with the small returns to the Commonwealth which this bill indicates we will receive, and what we must share with the other States, we of New York, at least, must be pardoned if we object to the injustice and impracticability of such legislation.

More than that, we are just entering upon a struggle for a condition in this country which, if successful, as I hope it will be, will require all the ingenuity of the present directors of affairs to raise funds sufficient for its inception and progress. It is a matter, it seems to me, of greater importance than the question of whether or not a wealthy State, or a coterie of wealthy States, should put their hands in their pockets for the benefit of the highways of their poorer sisters. Not that we love them less, but we love the good name of our country more. Indeed, I believe the time has arrived, until at least

we settle on some definite policy of what is to be done to insure by strength the peace of this country, that we should vote for no appropriation for other than the usual necessitous work. Until that question is settled, settled not only as to policy, but as to the amount of the expenditure and from whence the funds are coming, highways can wait, if need be. The welfare of the country at large is far more dear to the heart of the patriotic American, be he a resident of a small State or a great one.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] has nine minutes which he reserved on Saturday, and I now yield to him.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am so intensely interested in the good-roads propaganda, so vitally concerned in seeing a beneficent road system spread like a great web all over our country, reaching into the remotest nooks and corners of every part of our fair land, that I expect to give this bill my support, realizing at the time I do it that it has many defects and falls far short of what I would like to see incorporated in a bill of this character. And since those in charge of the bill have invited criticism of its provisions, I shall venture to point out what I deem to be a few of its defects. There are several defects to which I would like to call attention, but I take it that before I get through with the one to which I desire to direct my remarks my time will have expired. The title of this bill, so far as the State of Kentucky is concerned, is a misnomer. Ostensibly this bill is being passed for the purpose of rendering national aid to the various States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

That is ostensibly the object and the purpose of this bill. It is so expressed in the title of it. So far as the State of Kentucky is concerned, I desire to say that no such thing will happen in that Commonwealth. I desire to point out, if I can do it, that but a very small proportion of this Federal aid, if this bill passes and the money is afterwards appropriated, will go to the rural post roads in the State of Kentucky. Section 3 of the Shackleford bill provides that the money appropriated under this bill shall be expended in the various States in accordance with the laws of those States. In order to know, then, how this bill is going to work in the various States of this Union, we will have to know what the various State laws are on that subject. I am not familiar with them, except that I am more or less familiar with the road law on the statute books in the State of Kentucky. That road law is, in substance, this: That the entire road system of the State is under the control of the commissioner of roads. A 5-cent tax on each \$100 worth of taxable property is set apart as a road fund. Before any county in the State can get any State aid the county has to be taxed twice—first on the road fund generally and then it has to put up dollar for dollar. For every dollar that the county puts up the State puts up a dollar. Then, when this money is put up, on what roads will it go?

Under the provisions of the Kentucky road law the only roads upon which the State can render any aid at all are those roads that lead from one county seat town to the county seat towns of the adjoining counties. These are the roads, and these are the only roads, upon which any State aid can go until all these various roads have been constructed. That being true, on what rural post roads will this Federal money be put in the State of Kentucky? Only on those post roads or State highways leading from one county seat town to the next county seat town, and it can not be put on them unless they are used as post roads. And that is the way this law will operate in my State. Not only that, but under our law this State road fund that every county is taxed to help put up will only go to the counties that take advantage of the provisions of the State law. The great majority of the counties in the State of Kentucky are not meeting the requirements of the State road law in that State. That being true, under the provisions of the Kentucky road law this State road fund, which would have gone to a certain county if it had met the requirements at the end of each year, goes back into the general road fund to go into the counties of the State that do meet the requirements.

And, further than that, the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore has this as one of its planks:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

To State and local authorities! This bill does not propose to give any part of this money to the local authorities, but to turn over the entire control of the entire sum to the various States of this Union.

Now, then, if any money should go to the State of Kentucky, if this bill passes and it should become a law—I reckon nobody seriously thinks it will become a law as long as the present occupant of the White House remains in power; of course, it will not become a law, and I reckon nobody is deceived about that—

but if it should become a law and should be put upon the statute books of this country, the Kentucky money will go to the State of Kentucky as a State, and no part of it will go to the various counties in the Commonwealth. That being true, since it goes to the State and is a part of the State fund, then the various counties in the State, in order to take advantage of its provisions, will have to put up just as much money as they would have had to put up if this bill had never become a law at all. That is the way this bill is going to work and operate, so far as the State of Kentucky is concerned.

I am not familiar with the road laws of the various States of this Union, but I desire to call attention to the fact that under the provisions of this bill the Federal money will have to be applied in accordance with the laws of the State in which the Federal money is to go.

There are a good many other features of this bill of which I do not at all approve. The idea of putting this money in the exclusive control of the various States and letting the Government have no sort of control over the money it appropriates after it puts it up, no sort of jurisdiction over the post roads on which it puts its money, is not advisable. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MONTAGUE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, how does the exact time stand now in respect to this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] controls 31 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] 64 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield some time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the Chair state is remaining to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 31 minutes.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill because I believe the Government has a right to appropriate money for this purpose, and because it is wise to do it. I represent a congested industrial district, with very few farmers in it. I would wish that we had many more farmers, on account of their great usefulness and the good citizenship they represent. But I feel that this appropriation will benefit the people in the industrial sections as well as those in the agricultural districts. Indeed, good roads are of such inestimable value to all classes that it is folly to attempt to particularize as to whom they will benefit.

Though Pennsylvania is a rich State, it has 90,000 miles of public highways. It has spent a lot of money in recent years to build roads and has extensive plans for the future, but much the larger part of that 90,000 miles is in a rough condition, and the \$1,400,000 that will come from this appropriation to Pennsylvania will be exceedingly helpful in the colossal task that confronts that State in taking care of any reasonable part of this 90,000 miles.

With the 2,300,000 miles of public highways in the Nation and only a comparatively small portion of these arteries in proper condition, the vast means necessary in the large area but less populous States for the construction of the needed modern road are beyond their reach. The rapid development of our country, its vast needs, together with the inconceivable requirements in food, raiment, and so forth, of its greatly increasing population make the means of transportation and distribution an ever-pressing question.

Cooperation between the Federal Government and the States will not only result in needed financial assistance to the States in their colossal road-building burdens but also in the benefits from the advancement made in the science of road making

through the interchange of thought and experiences between the Nation and the States.

Notwithstanding our more than 300,000 miles of splendid railroads—nearly as much as all the rest of the world possesses—James J. Hill, the railway magnate and expert, has repeatedly stated that an expenditure of \$500,000,000 a year for 10 years in railroad equipment would be necessary to meet the demands of our great growth, also adding that the time was not far distant when the artificial highways would not be equal to these requirements and that the natural highways of the water-courses must be utilized in this service. I doubt if the public highway, with its great possibilities in transportation by the use of the automobile, was in Mr. Hill's mind, but there are the 2,300,000 miles of public roads and millions of automobiles awaiting utilization in our giant strides of progress for the benefit of humanity.

The Government may well, properly and most usefully, lend a helping hand to the States in this great development for the common good. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I have gone over the provisions of this bill very carefully and I have also listened assiduously to the debates on the bill in the last few days. I heard my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] say that surely the Delaware Member in this House should vote for this bill because of the proportionate amount of money it gave to the State of Delaware and the amount of roads there. Unfortunately I can not agree with him, and it is my intention to vote against the bill.

Representing as I do on the floor of this House the State at large, I feel that I should state a few of my reasons why I shall vote against it, although it looks like a good bill to people in a farming community. I beg to state that in Delaware there are far more country communities than there are urban; in other words, the State is almost wholly agricultural in its area. It would be a very easy matter for me to vote for this bill, because, apparently, it is in the interest of the country community. But, in my opinion, we should consider this measure not from the standpoint of the particular good it might do our own particular district or our own State, but we should consider it from the national standpoint as national legislators.

This bill provides \$25,000,000, to be distributed all over the country. Why, gentlemen, to use a mining expression, the surface of the earth would hardly be scratched by this \$25,000,000. I know it to be a fact that in the case of the few good roads that we have in my State, where we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, if we should take advantage of this bill and receive the \$103,000, or twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the total amount, it would really do them no good when it came to actual constructive road building.

It is not my duty to call the attention of the Members on my side of the House to this bill, nor that of the people on the majority side, but I do not see how anybody, after listening to the address of the President of the United States at the opening of this Congress can conscientiously vote for this measure. Two very salient points were brought forth in that address by the President, namely, the question of national defense and the raising of additional revenue; and surely those Members on the Democratic side and those on our side who intend to support the President in national-defense matters can not vote for this measure that is brought in here before we have considered how that question is to be dealt with, pro or con, in this body.

And, furthermore, the majority, as all know in this House, is laboring to-day with one of the greatest dilemmas that has ever been put up to a party in power in deciding the question of how to raise the revenue necessary to run the Government for the remainder of this administration. At the end of the first fiscal year under this administration no one will deny that a deficit was shown in 1914, one month before the European war began, which made it necessary for the administration to resort to stamp taxes, about which our able leader of the minority [Mr. MANN] has spoken to-day.

I do not base my opposition to this bill on the conflict of interest between the country people and the city people, because, as I said before, I represent a State which is agricultural in area, all with the exception of one city. But, with the important questions that we have pending before us to-day, which were brought out in the President's address at the opening of this session, I do not see how any man can conscientiously vote for this bill.

With all due respect to the honorable committee that brought in this majority report, I wish to say that that report, as com-

pared with the minority report prepared by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is eloquent in what it did not say in favor of this bill rather than in what it did say in favor of it. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the gentleman [Mr. MILLER of Delaware] who has just spoken. While this Government will no doubt make proper preparation for its national defense, it is not necessary that we should become hysterical upon that proposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not necessary that we should abandon all propositions looking to the improving of our domestic conditions. This Government will move along smoothly, whatever troubles may forebode.

This is a proposition in which the overwhelming masses of the American people are profoundly interested. It carries authorization for an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the improvement of rural roads. In the limited time I have, of course, I can not enter into the discussion of the various objections made to this measure, but I desire to give it my hearty approval and indorsement and ask permission of the House to incorporate in the RECORD some extracts from a former issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, being part of a speech that I made upon this subject in the House about eight years ago. [Applause.]

I have been especially interested in the waterways improvement, but not more than in the improvement of public roads. Both are essential to the convenience, prosperity, and happiness of our people. Frequently I have discussed the question of Federal aid in the construction of public roads. I favor this bill, as I have favored others to lift the rural American population out of the mud and grant to them the benefits that necessarily follow improved highways. Perhaps I could not better express myself to-day on this question than I did on March 3, 1908, when I spoke in the House of Representatives on the amendment that I then proposed to the post-office and post-roads bill. The RECORD referred to of that date, pages 2824 and following, show in part what I then said on the subject of good roads, as follows:

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. After that section, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask permission to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That a sum not to exceed \$500,000 of this appropriation may be expended by the Postmaster General, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, in improving the conditions of rural delivery routes to be selected by them, for the purpose of ascertaining the possible increase in the territory which could be served by one carrier, and the possible increase of the number of delivery days each year, the amount required for proper maintenance in excess of local expenditure for rural delivery routes, and the relative saving to the Government in the maintenance of rural delivery routes by reason of such improvements: *Provided further*, That the State or county or counties which may be selected for improvement of rural delivery routes therein under this provision shall furnish an equal amount of money for the improvement of the rural routes so selected.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. This amendment is possibly subject to the point of order that it is new law, and on the objection of a single Member of the House may be precluded from consideration under the rule. No such rule obtains in the Senate. That body may therefore act on this question in the public interest and force the House to its final consideration when the disagreeing votes of the two Houses are to be adjusted in conference. But the opportunity will be given to the House to act, if it will, as the amendment will be presented. That this amendment should become the law is essential in the public interest. It need not be concealed that the amendment, if not considered here, will be introduced and acted on in the Senate. Nor is it necessary here to conceal the fact that it is intended as an experiment to ascertain the facts on which shall rest the beginning of a system of good roads throughout the United States. That it is to the supreme benefit of the people to have a complete system of good roads by Federal aid, if the same can be constitutionally obtained, is so clear that it is idle to discuss it. That such a system is needed for the expeditious transportation of overland rural mail must be clear when the almost intolerable condition of rural-route roads in the greater part of the country is known of all men, for expedition can not be had without such improvement. That the United States and the States or counties getting the benefit of the roads should jointly contribute to their improvement seems only to be just. That the United States and the States or counties are capable of gradually making the necessary road improvement I think will not be denied. That the increased wealth of the people in general, by reason of this needed internal improvement, will more than compensate for the expenditure is at least an incidental inducement to the expenditure, although, logically, it may seem not a justification for it when separated from postal necessities. Then, what is in the way of a modest beginning of this essential public work, which will be worth more to the masses of our people in direct and immediate benefits than the rivers and harbors and the Panama Canal combined? [Applause on the Democratic side.] So magnificent will be the result to our people living in the rural sections that it seems criminal to delay the beginning when the States and counties join, as they will join, in the improvement and share with the United States the benefits. Can it be said that Congress is without power? Shall it be said that it is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of the States? If either proposition could be maintained, then we should

desist. If they can not be, why not begin the great work? The second proposition falls if the first can be overcome, because it is involved in it.

The United States is a Government of limited and delegated powers. Just such power as is conferred on Congress by the Constitution it may exercise, and such other power as may be fairly implied from the express power granted and necessary to carry it out. It is sovereign within the sphere of its constitutional jurisdiction; it is powerless outside of it. The State rights consist of the rights and powers that belong to a complete sovereign, save only those conferred on the United States in the Constitution. No State of this Union is therefore a complete sovereign, because it has yielded a part of its sovereign power to another political entity—the United States; and the United States is not a complete sovereignty, because there are sovereign rights that belong to the States—rights reserved and not yielded to the United States. The State is only a partial sovereign. The United States is only a partial sovereign. Their sovereign powers are distinct and separate. It takes both to make a complete sovereignty. In this is the strength of the dual system of government. In which government—State or Federal—rests the power to establish post roads? The United States Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, in section 8, subsection 7, Article I, gives to Congress the right to establish post offices and post roads. This delegation of power makes Congress supreme on this question. The grant of the power carried with it the right to exercise such other powers as are necessary to enforce the same. It follows that the United States could, by purchase or condemnation proceedings, obtain the right of easement or use in any land in any State for post-road purposes. (which is a governmental purpose) not already in use by the State for State governmental purposes, just as the State can condemn United States lands for State governmental purposes not in actual use for United States governmental purposes. These questions have long since been settled by State and Federal judicial decisions. The power exists, therefore, in Congress to establish these roads for postal service by express terms of the Constitution. Who shall object to cooperation by the State or the county with the United States in a work in which is joint and mutual benefit? The machinery for the perfection of this work may be Federal or State, as may seem best. These are not new propositions. This is the time for action. There has been enough discussion. If gentlemen complain of the form of the amendment, offer a better suggestion, and let it pass. Let us know now who is for and who is against this system of internal improvement.

It may be that the parcel-post proposition will present itself for consideration under the bill. A parcel-post system confined to rural-delivery routes at a rate compensatory to the Government might prove beneficial; but, in my judgment, this is questionable until the rural routes are so improved as to make the delivery of parcels speedy and satisfactory. The people are demanding improved conditions in all branches of the public service, and where these are practicable, or can be made so, it is the duty of the Representatives to respond to the public demand.

Unfortunately, a great portion of our public men regard the development of Federal power as destructive of the rights of States. This is true if such development be questionable under the Constitution; but if the Constitution confers a power on Congress, the development and exercise of that power to its full limit by the Federal Government neither destroys nor impairs any right of the States, for such right is not reserved, and, being delegated to the United States, does not belong to the State. The more speedy the full and complete development of all Federal power and authority under the Constitution comes, the more accurate will be the lines of demarcation on all questions of jurisdiction between State and Federal Government, and the more readily will the governments, State and Federal, adjust themselves to their constitutional orbits, from which neither may come to encroach upon the other. These governments are not intended to be inimical, but wholly interdependent and cooperative, each maintaining and exercising separately their powers as determined by the Constitution. [Applause.]

When we improve our great waterways, concerning which there is but little difference of opinion, it is for the benefit of the people of the entire Union, but the people of the States where the harbors are, or through which the rivers flow, get the most direct benefits. What right has the United States Government to claim jurisdiction over all the navigable waters in the States and remove the obstructions to the transportation of commerce placed therein by nature? The Constitution confers the power. It is a Federal and not a State right exercised in the interest of commerce. The right to establish post roads in the State is also a Federal constitutional right. Why should it not be exercised in the interest of the expeditious delivery of mail to the people, and incidentally to the benefit of overland commerce? This power is now dormant. No legislative action has imparted vitality to it. It is one of those Federal powers not yet fully exercised. In my judgment, its exercise will be beneficial to the States and to the United States; and surely the exercise by the United States of one of its powers can not be held to impair State rights.

The United States has exclusive jurisdiction, as I said, over the navigable waters in the States—waters navigable in fact and not merely declared so by statute. It does not own the river bed over which the stream flows; this is the property of the State. It does not own the river banks; these belong to the landowners adjacent. It has no riparian rights. It does not even own the water in the stream, for it may be used by private individuals, unless its use should reduce the quantity of the water or the flow of the stream so as to impair navigation. The United States simply has the right to the use of the stream to maintain navigation. Its jurisdiction for securing and maintaining navigation is complete. It is an express power exercised in pursuance to the Constitution to secure the consummation of a particular purpose, and that purpose is navigation free to all the people of all the States. The power to carry the mails to all the people over any portion of any State in the Union belongs to the United States Government, and it may open up post roads for this purpose, but in so doing no part of the soil of the State would belong to the United States, but merely an easement or right of way on a chosen road to carry the mails. It would have no special jurisdiction over the roads; the State would reserve its civil and criminal jurisdiction. The United States would have no more right on the road than a citizen would have except for the improvement thereof in cooperation with State or county authorities and for carrying mail. The right to protect its mails it now has everywhere. The apprehensions of many on this question are ill-founded. Let us give to our country this initial step to the ultimate consummation of a perfected system of internal improvements which, in connection with our rivers and harbors and ship canal, will so develop and enhance our resources that this Republic shall become more wealthy and more powerful than all the nations of Europe combined. [Applause.]

This was only an experimental proposition, but the suggestion of the development of good roads by Federal aid was not strong enough then in the House to demand a majority. Its advocates have since been insistent, and in 1912 the House passed an amendment to the post office and post roads bill authorizing the appropriation of \$25,000,000 for good roads. The Senate refused to agree to this item, and passed an amendment directing the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on the Post Office and Post Roads to appoint several special committees, including one on good roads, to which the House agreed. In the conference that followed on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the conference committee, of which I was a member on the part of the House, agreed on an experimental road fund of \$500,000 under a suggestion similar to the one proposed by me on March 3, 1908. This was passed by both Houses and became a law—Public law No. 336. This was the same conference in which, by the direction of the other conferees, Senator Bourne, of Oregon, and myself drafted the parcel-post law, combining the provisions of my bill and amendments in the House and his in the Senate, and other provisions, which was adopted by Congress. On August 24, 1912, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11850, the following appears:

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the committees appointed by Mr. Moon of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The committees appointed by Mr. Moon of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, under the act of August 24, 1912, making appropriation for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, were:

Committee on Pneumatic Tubes: Mr. BLACKMON of Alabama, Mr. MURDOCK of Kansas.

Committee on Second Class Mail Matter and Compensation for Railway Mail Service: Mr. LLOYD of Missouri, Mr. TUTTLE of New Jersey, Mr. WEEKS of Massachusetts.

Committee on the Post Roads: Mr. SHACKLEFORD of Missouri, Mr. MCGILLICUDDY of Maine, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. MADDEN of Illinois, Mr. AUSTIN of Tennessee. (RECORD, p. 11850, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

The result of the work of the committee appointed on good roads was the establishment by Congress of a permanent Good Roads Committee in the House. That committee has presented to you the pending bill. It is not, perhaps, just what some of you may want, but it is a good measure and deserves the support of the House. It is the beginning in a more substantial way of a work that should have been commenced long ago, and should continue until it is accomplished. The experimental stage is passed. Good roads are recognized as a public necessity. The agricultural, commercial, manufacturing, and educational interests of the country must necessarily be expanded by a completed system of good rural roads. The constitutionality of the undertaking, the benefits to be derived from it, the advancement of the people in all that makes for their welfare so clearly appear that there ought not to be any opposition to the measure. But some insist that it is unconstitutional to do this work for the people. These need only to be referred to that section of the Constitution heretofore mentioned. It is not merely an implied power, it is an express grant and delegated power which Congress has the right to exercise. Some say that it is class legislation. Class legislation, while obnoxious, is not prohibited by the Federal Constitution. But can it be that legislation that benefits directly two-thirds of our population and indirectly the whole population be called class legislation? It was said that it would benefit the farmers and laborers only and is therefore class legislation. Were this true, it would not condemn but commend the bill to all thoughtful and just men.

The farmers and laboring people of our country constitute an overwhelming majority of our population, and yet they have had but little done for them in the way of Federal legislation. Who are they anyway? They live not upon their wits but as God commands "by the sweat of their brows." By their labor they furnish that upon which all mankind exists. Largely freed by constant work as they are from the machinations of idle minds, unsound and immoral thoughts and practices, they are our best citizens in times of peace and our best soldiers in time of war. [Applause.] It was their blood that purchased the Nation's liberty; it is their labor that maintains the Nation's power and greatness. Shall we deny the benefits of just legislation to them?

If I understand the sentiment of this House, it is not only our purpose to pass this measure to improve rural roads but to perfect the parcel-post system that it may be of still greater benefit to the farmer and to the general public and to establish a system of rural credits by which the farmer can secure at a low rate of interest, on long-term loans, money to purchase lands and make homes or to improve those he now owns. The time has happily passed when Congress dares longer to ignore the rights of the producing or laboring classes of this Republic.

These measures are but the legitimate outgrowth of a true Democracy responding to the demands of the people for the improvement of national conditions among many measures proposed by the Democratic Party since its ascendancy to power in the United States. We must look to the advancement and the progress of our country along all lines, and we must not hesitate longer to protect the rural population of our country and to grant to them these demands to which they are entitled. What is \$25,000,000 to this people, with the contribution of \$25,000,000 more by the States annually for these purposes until accomplished? It sounds like a great deal, but it amounts to but little after all. Why, sirs, there is one bill that comes into this House that carries \$320,000,000. It is for the interest of the American people everywhere, and the demand has always been made for progress in that great department of the Government which it provides for—the Postal Department. No greater demand and no greater necessity exists than this law for the establishment and the maintenance of post roads to carry the means of information from one end of this Republic to the other to the people, and I commend it to your favor. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe in internal improvements within the United States. I would much prefer to see our money spent here than to have it spent in foreign countries or in making toward the improvement of foreign countries or colonial possessions.

I believe in the improvement and the development of the waterways of the United States. We have 50,000 miles of waterways, navigable and nonnavigable, and only half of them improved. If they were all improved there would be less congestion in the great cities and more activity in the country. One of the reasons for the improvement of waterways is that railroads have taken the farmer away from the soil that God seems to have provided for him, to the lines of the railroads; there the people throng together, so that business is concentrated, while vast areas of the country go unpopulated and unused.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Are we to understand that the gentleman is in favor of any plan to reduce the population of the City of Brotherly-Love and drive them to the country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not on normal grounds; but when it comes to undue congestion, I would say that it would be a good thing for the people of Philadelphia and a good thing for the people in the country, where farms are now begging for labor, if many of those who are not able to obtain as good a livelihood in the city as they could obtain on the farm, could be induced to leave the city and go to the farm. [Applause.]

The gentleman's question brings up the very interesting economic and sociological fact that the farmer, on the average, is progressing more successfully to-day than the deliver in the city. It is a fact sometimes overlooked in our debates. In the district I have the honor to represent, there is probably not an acre of unimproved ground. Everything except the streets and the public squares is built over. Yet there, in the hurly-burly of the people, rushing to work in the morning and rushing back at night, there are thousands whose positions are not so good as they would be on the farm, whose earning power is not so great, and whose lives would be happier and healthier if they were in the country. They do not do so well on the back streets and alleys of a great city as they usually do upon the farm. I have mentioned this before.

But, coming back to waterways, I believe in the improvement of waterways, because it would open up new stretches of country that have been unpopulated even since colonial times. It is not commonly known that one-half the arable land in the area of the thirteen original States is still awaiting the settler, or the coming of the tiller of the soil. Even as you are discussing irrigation in the West; even as you are proposing reclamation for other sections, we still have this eastern land available, already irrigated and awaiting the settler.

Now, if it is a good thing to open up the 148 rivers that traverse the Atlantic seaboard, as I contend it is, to say nothing of the tens of thousands of navigable miles of river elsewhere, would it not be a good thing also to give our assistance to the opening up of good roads, which also induce the urban population to become suburban, and which give encouragement to the man who tills the soil. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, from which we must expect legislation to provide this \$25,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman would be betraying any secrets of the committee if he would inform the House where this money is to come from.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a question of responsibility that I am leaving to the majority, who have not yet unfolded their plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I simply want to add, in the interest of fairness and from the national viewpoint, that the city and the country could get together more quickly and there would be a better understanding all along the line if we should open up the avenues of communication and make transportation easier by rail, by road, and by water. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, our National Government early in its beginning favored national aid for good roads. The policy was continued and maintained until 1840. Then it was abandoned. There was no question at that time in the minds of the early statesmen of our country about the constitutionality of national aid for good road purposes. They were mainly the very men who had the making of the Constitution itself, and as there was no serious criticism or division of opinion at that time on the subject, I do not think there should be in this day and generation.

I was gratified to hear the statement of the gentleman from the great city of Philadelphia, Mr. Moore, and I think he properly stated this proposition. This is not a contest between the city and country; this is a great national question involving the development and upbuilding of the entire country. We could not possibly have the city prosperous without the country being prosperous, and, on the other hand, we could not build up the country districts without the city receiving the benefit from it. We have an immense empire extending from ocean to ocean—3,000,000 square miles, with an average population of 30 to the square mile. The great burden of providing national highways, for cheap transportation, for building up our country, for making rural life more agreeable and more attractive, is too stupendous a financial burden upon the States and local communities to carry forward without the assistance of the National Government. If Congress could give millions of valuable acres of land out of the public domain for the construction of railroads and thus aid in building up the western country, I think we have reached the point where Congress can appropriate money out of the Public Treasury to still further the development of our country and the prosperity of the rural districts of all the States of the Union. [Applause.]

It is no excuse to say where is the money coming from. I have great respect for the leader of my party, but if that argument should prevail against this proposition, the question of how the majority are going to raise this revenue by a "stamp tax" we will prevent this House from practically doing anything in view of the fact that we have at present a deficit in the Treasury.

When we come to pass on the President's recommendation to expend \$300,000,000 to put the country in a proper defensive state and give us an increase in the Army and an effective Navy, then those of us who believe it is a patriotic duty of Congress to make provision for a larger Army and an adequate Navy can not shirk or avoid our patriotic duty in this House by stopping to question or consider whether the taxation in order to meet that expense is going to be a stamp tax or some other tax that is unpopular. The public sentiment of this country I have found to be overwhelmingly, and has been for many years, that out of the billion dollars we vote out of the National Treasury we should vote a portion of that for the great national undertaking of the construction in connection with the States and counties of a public-road system. [Applause.]

I favor raising the necessary money for this and other needed legislation by increasing our tariff duties and not by a stamp or direct tax.

I recently made a trip to the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and one thing which attracted my attention more than anything else and which I think was a great agency for developing these new colonial possessions was the system of magnificent highways constructed in the islands. They have made them blossom like the rose. What we have done there in that line has received the commendation and the admiration of the world. If we can go seven or eight thousand miles away from our native shores to inaugurate an improvement which has developed these islands, why can not we begin our charity,

our patriotism, and our good work right here in the 48 States of the American Union? [Applause.]

The farmers of this country have had nothing out of the National Treasury of direct observable benefit except the rural delivery system. They are expecting, and have a right to expect, rural credit legislation, and in connection with that, the inauguration of national aid for good roads. There are several changes I would favor making in this bill, but if not made in the House we can urge the Senate to make them. Let us do something for good roads now. Let us make a beginning, and later we can amend or improve the law. One objection I have to this bill is that it does not carry a larger sum of money than \$25,000,000. It ought to be \$50,000,000, and we should appropriate as much money for roads annually as we do for rivers and harbors. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GORDON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 3518. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

RURAL POST ROADS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, what policy shall be adopted by Congress respecting national-road legislation? The opinion is almost unanimous among the Members of both Houses that good roads are a necessity; that it is desirable that the Federal Government contribute in some measure to their construction and maintenance, and that ample authority is found in the Constitution to permit appropriations by Congress for this purpose. The only question is as to the method of procedure.

In common with a number of other Congressmen, I have introduced a bill to provide for national aid to the several States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and while the pending measure does not entirely conform to my idea of what a good roads bill ought to be, yet I intend to give it my heartiest support because I know that the Committee on Roads has given most careful consideration to this legislation. Like most all of the other bills, the Shackleford bill contemplates an annual expenditure of \$25,000,000 for road construction and maintenance by the Federal Government, to be apportioned among the States and to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary will apportion the money appropriated among the States, after deducting a sum necessary for administrative purposes and a further sum sufficient to provide for an allotment of \$65,000 to each State, on the basis of population and the mileage of rural post roads and star routes. In this respect the pending measure differs from the bill which I introduced. It appears to me that it would be more equitable to the Western States to apportion the money—one-third according to the number of Senators and Representatives to which each State respectively is entitled in Congress, one-third in accordance with the ratio which the area of each State bears to the area of the United States, and the remaining one-third according to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes. I have no doubt, however, but that the committee had good reasons for adopting the method of dividing the appropriation as provided in this bill.

The bill before us very properly provides that in allotting Federal aid the Secretary of Agriculture shall deal with the States as units and not with the counties or other subdivisions, as has been proposed in the bills which passed this House on former occasions. After groping around learning costly lessons by experience, we have finally reached the conclusion that there is too much local control in the business of building roads. The most efficient plan that has as yet been devised in the United States for the construction and maintenance of public roads is to create a State highway department. Over one-half the States have already adopted this method of supervising their road work, and the passage of this bill means that before very long every State in the Union will provide by law for a State highway department or a State highway engineer having authority to supervise and direct the construction and maintenance of the public roads and highways of the State.

According to the terms of this bill the State highway departments will submit plans of proposed construction to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will then determine in each case the proportion of the estimated cost to be borne by the Federal Gov-

ernment, which shall not be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent, the balance to be contributed by the State. The money expended by the States on road work is raised by direct taxation. By requiring the States to contribute from one-half to two-thirds of the cost of any road the Federal Government obtains the advantage of the watchfulness by the taxpayers of the State over State expenditures, because the State highway departments can not waste Federal appropriations without also wastefully expending State funds.

Pleas for economy have always fallen on deaf ears in Congress. The fear of an empty Treasury is the only check on appropriations. If all of the revenues of the Government, however, were raised by a tax on incomes, the profession of watch dog of the Treasury would soon be as popular at Washington as it now is in the State legislatures. It is said that at present the best insurance for a long congressional career is never to vote to increase a direct tax or to reduce an appropriation. Since the sentiment for economy in Congress is purely academic, it is certainly the part of wisdom to enlist the support of the payers of direct taxes in the States in guarding the expenditure of Federal road funds.

By recognizing and encouraging the establishment of State highway departments we permit each State to solve its own road problems. The State of Maine is one of the summer playgrounds of the Nation, and the people there find that it is profitable to build roads for the use of tourists who come to enjoy the climate and the scenery. Kansas is no summer resort, but the farmers of that Commonwealth produce enormous crops of corn and wheat, that are expensive to market when the roads are bad. A system of highways designed for Maine would give poor satisfaction in Kansas. Why should not each State be permitted to use the funds received from the Federal Treasury in the manner that will serve its people best?

There is no sound basis for the fears of those who believe that State control of highway construction means that interstate roads will not be built. They insist that main lines of railroads were built first and the branch lines came afterwards. This statement is not historically correct, except as to the land-grant railroads of the West, and their prompt completion to the Pacific coast as a military necessity was stimulated by the aid received from the United States. Every large railway system east of the Mississippi is made up of a number of short lines that have been united into through routes. These combinations were not made until the traffic between distant points reached such a volume that through trains were necessary. Whenever interstate travel by automobiles reaches such proportions that continuous highways are demanded, then the State highway departments will not have any great difficulty in agreeing upon common meeting points on the State boundary lines. The American people will ultimately get all the highways that they want, but the kind of roads they need most will be obtained first.

I am glad that section 5 of this bill contains the following language:

* * * that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes; one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Let us not despise the dirt roads, for they are like the common people whom "God must love, because he has made so many of them." In our hope for highways of perfect construction, we should not fail to give consideration, if not praise, to this humble servant of internal commerce. As Gov. Major, of Missouri, than whom there is no better friend of good roads, said in his remarks to the Committee on Roads at the hearings last year—

It is the dirt road, representing the first leg of the journey, and over which moves the traffic of the Republic, that serves the Nation most. These roads reach out like tentacles into the country life, and their improvement will mean more than any other one achievement which can be brought about. The farmer, when he makes a haul, must gauge his load not by the macadam road over which he passes a part of the distance, but by the bad dirt road he must travel. When it comes to determining what character of roads shall receive Federal aid, I ask what are you going to do about the dirt road—the real road of the people?

There will be some objection to the improvement of dirt roads with appropriations from the Federal Treasury by those who favor the construction of highly improved national highways connecting the State capitals and large centers of population, but, in my opinion, the national-highway advocates are now willing to accept this bill as a compromise. Personally I have never countenanced the abuse that has been heaped upon the heads of those who hope to see this country gridironed with highly improved touring roads. It has been charged that the sentiment for national highways has been fostered and organized

by the manufacturers of automobiles and road-making machinery. Associated with them are the owners of patents for road materials and the makers of blasting powder. It is said that, in order to influence public opinion, representatives of these industries secure appointments as delegates to good-roads conventions and that money is furnished to pay the expenses of organizers who travel over the country laying out routes for national highways. No one has suggested that there is anything wrong in all this activity except that subscriptions have been collected in some towns that were left off the routes as afterwards located.

In truth, the work done by these manufacturers in behalf of national highways has served a most useful purpose. They have promoted the organization of highway associations all over the country and convincing arguments in favor of better roads have been given the widest publicity. The American Automobile Association, in its advocacy of national highways, has also rendered a great service. There was no real good-roads movement in America until this association and others interested in the construction of improved ways of travel put their shoulders to the wheel. The only legitimate criticism that can be made against this demand for national construction of highways is that it comes from a special interest and does not take into consideration the needs of all the people.

The Committee on Roads has been criticized for defining a "rural post road" to mean "any public road over which mail is or might be carried," but I believe that the committee acted wisely in adopting this language instead of confining Federal appropriations to roads actually used in the delivery of the United States mail. Rural-delivery routes begin and end at the same place—the post office. They go out in circuits and follow for only a part of the way the market roads that the farmers use to reach the trading centers. To confine Federal aid to the rural-route mileage, as provided in former bills, would not assist the commerce of any community, because the average load would still be measured by the unimproved condition of the intermediate roads. Continuous roads not only serve the public better but they are much cheaper to maintain. All public roads and highways, while kept up and maintained as such, have been declared by law to be post routes. This declaration was proper because every road is potentially a post route. Endless delay would ensue if a special act of Congress were necessary every time a new rural route was established or an old route changed to cover new territory. It is neither wise nor necessary that the expenditure of Federal funds be limited to the roads actually traveled by a rural carrier, roads that go zig-zagging over the country, dodging around among the section lines.

According to the table printed as a part of the report of the Committee on Roads favorably recommending the passage of this bill, Arizona will be entitled to a total allotment of \$117,512 each year. There is no doubt in my mind that the State of Arizona will make excellent use of this money. The legislature of my State has provided for an annual tax levy sufficient to raise the sum of \$250,000 as a State road fund, so that we have the money available for the State's share of the cost of any road approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arizona has also provided for a State highway department under the supervision of a State engineer, so that we can meet the requirements of this bill in the matter of dealing with the State as a unit.

In all frankness, I must say that there is some division of sentiment among the people of my State as to just what should be done in the way of legislation providing for Federal aid in the construction of good roads, but I have explained to everyone who has asked me that I intended to vote for any good roads bill that might be placed upon its passage. I am anxious to see something done by Congress to assist the States in this most important work, and the only way to get Federal aid is to appropriate the money from the Treasury. Undoubtedly experience will teach us that some features of this bill should be changed, but we can safely leave the perfection of our highway legislation to future Congresses. There never will be a better time to initiate this policy than at the present moment. The Spaniards have a proverb which says that "the road to tomorrow leads to the house of never"; let us talk no longer about "Mañana," but do it now. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY].

Mr. OAKLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this interesting discussion has seemed to be a sort of forum for new Members, and that is my excuse for these few words. I am not concerned, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, that this bill was a part of the platform written at Baltimore, because that interesting document has been relegated to the field of political fiction by Executive order. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to discuss the fact that we all want good roads, because it is an axiom—we all do. I was born on a farm in the congressional district of President Wilson, and one of the great trials of my young life was the bad roads of that community. Coming to Washington, I found that macadam roads now surround that farm, built by taxpayers through a very efficient State organization of the great State of New Jersey. I now have the honor in part to represent another one of that cluster of States that were the pioneers in good road building. We have now a very efficient State organization. We have spent many millions of dollars, and are preparing in the future to spend many more, to make our highways worthy of the splendid history of our little State.

We do not think it quite fair, my friends. I have noticed on this floor that all of those States that have not been efficient in road building, that have not established public-highway commissions, that have been laggard, perhaps, in this great improvement, are in favor of this bill. Our people have been taxed, and particularly those who ride behind gasoline engines, for the splendid improvement of the highways of our State, and we do not think it quite fair that we should pay at least a part of the burden of those who have not done so.

That this is a question concerning the movement of great military adventures in the future I do not believe. I do not think that that is a serious problem in this discussion; but, my friends, as an inexperienced Member I could not help but think, in the last few days of this discussion, of where we are going. Within the last few days I have heard discussed on this floor propositions of Federal aid for various and divers things—aid to fight the chestnut blight, aid to fight the citrus canker, aid to fight the rabies in coyotes of the Northwest, special educational aid, special sanitary aid for the rural districts, to which appropriations I do not object collectively. I have therefore wondered when and where it will stop. It seems to me that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois got at the meat of this situation. Can this Government, under its present condition and what seems imminent to us in the future, afford to levy more stamp taxes to build rural roads? Is it not rather the obligation of those who surround and live along those highways to do as we have done, and with pride for their States and their communities at least attempt to inaugurate the same system?

I believe that this bill will not only be used to inaugurate this system in the States which have not already done so, but that it is the hope that the Federal aid will be asked and instituted to continue it, and I appeal to you, my colleagues, that it is not fair, that it is dangerous, to go further.

A gentleman on the other side a few moments ago said, "What is \$25,000,000 in a movement like this?" Twenty-five million dollars is a lot of money in the present state of the Federal Treasury. [Applause.] Therefore I ask that in the name of fairness, that in the name of our future difficulties, financial and otherwise, we be a little careful rather than that we give so much solicitude to the populist appeal to the people, that we give a little more care in safeguarding the Treasury of this great Republic against possible contingencies that seem likely to arise. [Applause.]

I am not particularly interested in the constitutionality of the proposition, because, in the first place, I do not know whether it is constitutional or not, and, in the second place, that ancient document has become irrelevant among friends.

The proposition to build roads in rural communities has many times been considered in this House. If the proposition to expend \$25,000,000 as an initial performance is successful, it is perfectly apparent that future appropriations for this purpose will be very large. I am, therefore, very strongly of the opinion that this is a bad precedent and an unfortunate time for such legislation.

The number and variety of our tax laws are not only becoming a burden but an irritating feature of our daily life. In my judgment, the stamp tax is the most odious of them all. If the tremendous expenditures now asked by the administration are in any sense to be put into force, this so-called stamp tax will be indeed a thing of beauty and a joy forever. This bill asks for an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to build roads in communities where in some sense, I think, they ought to do it themselves. This is my principal objection to the bill under consideration.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. OAKLEY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I am an advocate of the general proposition connected with the question of good roads. I have some slight knowledge of their construction, and have been associated with good-roads legislation in my own State.

In the locality which I have the honor to represent in part we have some 350 miles of State roads. Those State roads are approximately portions of what will eventually be a trunk-line system.

We also have a system of county roads, which are under the supervision of a commissioner, for which county appropriations are made for maintenance, and which are in no sense State roads.

This bill seeks to authorize a Federal-aid appropriation of \$25,000,000 for road construction in the several States. There is, to my mind, a very great difference between Federal aid for roads and Federal construction of roads.

Four things are clearly defined in the bill, the balance are stated in rather vague and indefinite terms. First comes the \$25,000,000 item; second, that amount is to be placed in the hands of a department official; third, by a system of gift distribution the amount is to be divided among the several States; and, fourth, that after such division is made control of the same is lost to the Federal authorities.

If this measure was seeking to put into operation an initial system of Federal trunk-line roads there would seem to be little or no objection to the proposition, but under the circumstances it does not appear to me that it is an opportune time to enact the measure now reported.

Reference has been made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], in his brilliant speech, to the fact that the larger States, and particularly New York, should have no hesitancy in giving part of their means to assist the other States. I will say that I believe New York State has always been a cheerful divider. As far as my knowledge goes, I think that no Federal appropriation has been afforded to the State or city of New York which has not been more than doubly repaid by either direct or indirect participation in the Government revenues. Furthermore, the subject of good roads is not a vital question at the present time nor is it one that has to be solved immediately. This Chamber is supposed to be the financial office as well as the legal office of this Government. We are expected to be careful of our own expenditures and to be rather more than careful about voting away the money of other people.

If instead of a minus Treasury we had a plus Treasury, if we had large revenues that provided for a surplus that could be fairly divided, if we were not confronted with complications throughout the world that may call for large appropriations to be made by this Congress, to be expended for what might be called involuntary expenditures, it possibly might be a proper time to consider this measure; but in view of the fact that we have little or no surplus, that we are already considering increasing our present internal taxation, I believe this entire subject should be deferred until matters of much graver importance are definitely settled. Believing as I do that this is not a good business measure to present at this time I can not, under the circumstances, justify myself in supporting the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to use the remainder of his time?

Mr. DUNN. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Seven minutes.

Mr. DUNN. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from New York that he has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DUNN. I yield back that time, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee comes from a part of the country which can not be expected to understand Massachusetts. In Massachusetts we have had the civilization of the public school; we have had free labor; we have built our own roads; we have been industrious; and we have been saving. The gentleman comes from that part of the country in which he was brought up under the civilization of the shotgun; that part of the country where the people, his forbears, thought that the only proper relation between capital and labor was that capital should own labor in fee simple. And so, Mr. Chairman, they have accumulated no money in his part of the country. I am sorry to say it is their own fault, and no wonder they wish to vote it out of other people's pockets. I have been in the House a good many years, and I have never

yet, when I intended to speak of a man in debate, failed to notify him beforehand so that he might be present. I have read over and over again the rule which forbids personalities in debate, but the gentleman from Missouri was very successful some years ago when he reeled like a drunken man up and down this floor, imitating the leader of his own party because, forsooth, he was left off from a committee that he thought he deserved to be put upon. [Applause on the Republican side.] And since that time the gentleman has been so often indulging in personal remarks that he has forgotten they are against the rule. Now, let me say to the gentleman that no matter who it is in this House, on either side, the man who says that the motives of those of us who are backing this movement for preparedness are on account of a desire to keep up any stock, or every stock, of any ammunition manufacturers speaks with an unclean mouth. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Missouri a question. While the language to which he has called attention in this amendment is perfectly understood by those of us who are here to vote upon it, is it not true that the language could be construed to apply to any city street, New York or Chicago, if anywhere in that street a strip of street might be found on which the houses were not less than 200 feet apart, so as to be carried further than the intent of the amendment?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It undoubtedly could, if the gentleman assumes both the State highway department and the Secretary of Agriculture would be guilty of bad faith. It can not be done without their consent. It could only be done with both of them approving it, which is hardly possible. We must impute good faith to the officers who have power conferred upon them, and I believe they will administer it according to the spirit of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that; but it seems to me that the language could be made so clear that even a man who did not want to act in good faith could not misinterpret it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I desire to submit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment. Page 1, line 9, after the word "thousand," insert "five hundred."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment to the committee amendment is to make it read "twenty-five hundred inhabitants" instead of "two thousand." I do it for this purpose: For a good many years the Census Bureau has been classifying rural and urban communities as follows: Those under 2,500 inhabitants as rural communities; those over 2,500 as urban. The thought of the people of this country has run along that line. Thousands of reports, essays, editorials, histories, and other documents have been issued, as well as thousands of speeches delivered, based upon the thought that 2,500 inhabitants is a fair, though an arbitrary, dividing line between urban and rural communities. Two thousand might just as well be taken for the dividing line in the bill if it were not for the long usage of the several departments of the Government, especially the Census Bureau. All the accumulated figures with reference thereto are in the line of 2,500 instead of 2,000. I think it ought to be accepted by the committee. I understand that 2,500 was selected by the Census Bureau from a long line of observation, covering years, that up to about that limit the towns served the immediate demands and purposes of the surrounding communities, but did not extend trade or influence beyond the next neighboring towns; that ordinarily towns of larger population became manufacturing centers and became subject to manufacturing and transportation influences, and because inhabited by manufacturing and transportation people these towns became commercial centers and spread their sphere of influence and trade beyond their immediate urban neighbors.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Two thousand is a perfectly arbitrary number placed there.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. As far as I am individually concerned, I see no difference between 2,000 and 2,500.

Mr. SLOAN. It would conform to the census practice and with the various documents they have given out for many years when distinguishing and talking about rural communities.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am not authorized by the committee to accept the amendment, but individually I see no difference between 2,000 and 2,500. It is merely arbitrary now.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two propositions in this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri to which I would like to call the attention of the committee. There is a feature in the last two lines of the amendment that has been handed around, which says:

That not more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

It seems to be an attempt on the part of this House to limit the appropriations to the mere trivial sum of \$25,000,000 a year for future Congresses. Now, the result of this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be that this would become permanent law, and next year when I offer an amendment in the next Congress to increase this appropriation from \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000 for that purpose, and the year after next when the gentleman from Missouri moves to increase the appropriation from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman is an optimist.

Mr. HOWARD (continuing). It would be subject to the point of order. Now, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bad amendment to adopt, because we all believe and feel when this horrible European war is over that the nations of the earth will get together and establish a court of arbitration for the settlement of future differences; that the navies and the great standing armies of the countries will be gradually disarmed each year until there will be no more navies or armies in existence, and all the tremendous sums we are appropriating now for the maintenance of the Army and Navy can be used upon public highways and in building up the material welfare of the country. For that reason I hope there will not be included in this bill the language:

That not more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

Mr. HOPWOOD, Mr. KENT, and Mr. WINGO rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Hopwood].

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, possibly what I have to say will not be worth saying, but I have some feeling about this measure that I desire to express. To begin with, I feel the gentleman from Missouri went far afield in attacking the gentleman from Massachusetts and the State of Massachusetts. I have had the pleasure of standing under that old elm tree up there, and I have had the pleasure of standing at Concord Bridge and at Bunker Hill, and any man who can stand at any one of those places and not feel patriotism rise within his breast and make of him a nobler and better man is not a true American. [Applause.]

I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in all he said the other day when he was arguing for preparedness here. I am for preparedness. He has made a study of that question, and he gave figures to support his contention. He has gone into the matter so fully that I was delighted to hear him. With much of what he said I agreed. We probably will find, however, that we will not wholly agree with any man here as to his opinion on any particular subject. However, I think we have gone far afield when we have brought in our differences of opinion on preparedness on such a peaceful thing as a road. I am for this bill, or I was. [Laughter.] I am sorry to be at difference, the first time I come here, with the leader on my side of the House. I am sorry that the question of the city and country comes up here. I am neither from the city nor from the country. I am from a town of about 15,000 people, which is neither one nor the other.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. I will.

Mr. MANN. One of the unfortunate things about being the selected leader of a party is that very often upon matters that are totally nonpartisan, such as this one, the leader of a party is put in an embarrassing position. I never have felt in the House that I should be deprived of the right to express a personal opinion, because gentlemen might be afraid that I would soon speak as the Republican leader on the floor. I will say to my friend, and to all other Republicans, that there is no party question involved in this measure that I know of. I hope gentlemen will not feel that they are under the slightest obligation to vote the way I do, however I vote, upon such a proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPWOOD. That relieves a new Member very much. However, I thought this question was nonpartisan. I so viewed it, and I felt that each Member had a right to a personal opinion on the question.

So just a word about it. I happen to live on the old Cumberland Road, which was the first road and the greatest road ever built in this country by the National Government. I came across those mountains the other day when coming to the session of

this Congress, and I left my town—Uniontown, Pa.—on the farther side of the mountains—the western ridge of the mountains—in the morning at 9 o'clock, and I arrived here at 6 o'clock in the evening, simply because that old Cumberland Road is kept in such a magnificent condition that it is as good as your magnificent streets here in the city, and I came flying over at the rate of 30 or 40 miles an hour.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the Pennsylvania speed limit?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Perhaps I ought not to have told that. I may get into trouble yet, although I think the limitation will probably save me now.

I want to say that I think we are all for good roads. It is only a question of how to get them. We used to build them in the township and have the supervisors attend to it. Then afterwards the county took a chance at it, and aid was given to the supervisors. Later on the State took it up, and the State of Pennsylvania is contributing now to the extent of three or four million dollars a year to help her counties build roads. Now, the National Government is asked to go back 75 or 100 years and take up what it started to do at that time and again aid in the building of roads. I think there is plenty of room in this great road-building propaganda in the United States to allow the Federal Government to take a part. I am sorry we can not take a greater part, and in view of the fact that our finances are not in the best of condition, probably \$25,000,000 is all we can afford to appropriate at this time. However, I am favorable to that amount to start with. It is not a very large sum. If we find the money with which to run this Government at all, out of that money we can take this \$25,000,000. So I am favorable to the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Can not the gentleman withhold that until we get through with this other amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, our President has stated that there is a vast amount of difference between State rights and State functions. The bill we are considering is a question in point. This matter of road building is peculiarly local in its nature. It concerns first the landowner, concerns next the small community, and next the county, next the State, and, last of all, the Federal Government. I believe that when the Federal Government goes into the business of road building it will open up a larger pork barrel than even the rivers and harbors bills could open. There will never be any limit or end to such legislation or such appropriation.

I happen to have the misfortune of owning a great many more or less useless acres of land in this country, and I would not have the gall or the nerve to go to the Federal Government to ask for one cent for road building in any locality where I am personally interested, and I do not believe that other landowners, small or large, should ask for Federal subsidy. We can not have the roads superintended from Washington. It is utterly impossible. They must be cared for and sustained by local communities, and any adequate system of inspection and preservation from Washington is an absurdity. Without a Federal inspection and repair Federal money would be dumped in a sewer. The roads must be maintained, if they are going to be good for anything, day by day, week by week, year by year, and that can never be done from the Central Government. It must be done by local communities, acting in their own interests and spending in conformity with those interests. Therefore I stand here opposed to Federal appropriations for what is fundamentally the duty and the obligation of local communities, and which is for the benefit of individuals under the fallacy of fee simple land tenure, which can only be controlled under taxation by local communities.

Some of us talk about money for such appropriations as though it came out of the air, as though it did not cost anybody anything. All taxes have one source, the pockets of our people.

The question of national defense is another question, but, as it has been dragged in, I must state that it is one in which I am interested along with every other American citizen. Money for this purpose is an insurance fund. How large that insurance fund should be I do not know and nobody here can tell. It is an insurance fund for the preservation of our national existence, for a demonstration of democracy amongst a self-contained, self-restrained people. No one has fought more bitterly against preparation for war than I have. No one has been a more ardent advocate of peace than I have been. And yet it seems to me that when you are out in a lot where there is a dangerous

bull, or going down a street where you are liable to meet a mad dog, you feel better if you have a pitchfork for the bull or a club for the dog. [Laughter and applause.]

That is our situation to-day. I used to believe that the world was becoming civilized, but I have lost some of my confidence in that assumption. I hope that we shall go ahead and play this game as a good man would play a game of poker. [Laughter and applause.] We must be able to call the bluff of people who seem to the rational to be rabid and insane, and then when the insanity has passed away we can pull in our horns and stop all talk of war insurance. But we must have the cards to justify a call; and, as we are dealing for ourselves, if we do not have them, that is our fault.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. KENT. Yes; with pleasure and gratitude.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just wanted to inquire what peculiar game it was that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KENT. Pinochle. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. In playing that game, which one is to be the loser? There must always be a loser, as I understand.

Mr. KENT. I know, but the bluffer sometimes wins in playing—in pinochle, I mean. [Laughter.] Anyhow, we must be able to make the bluff good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Delaware rise?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. To discuss the amendment.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending before the House.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order that the debate on the amendment has closed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order that there is one amendment pending, and an amendment to that amendment, and we must dispose of that before discussion is in order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported. Is the gentleman from Missouri going to vote for it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the figures "2,000" and inserting "two thousand five hundred."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of course those are figures written in the amendment. I would say strike out "2,000" in figures and insert "twenty-five hundred" in words.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I send it to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHEELER offers the following amendment to the amendment: After the word "year" insert the following: "and for the fiscal year 1917 and annually thereafter there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. WHEELER. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as this very important—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes a point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this very important amendment owing to the fact that it is possible, if this bill should be enacted into law, that the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate or in the House might refuse to appropriate.

True, under the present administration this amendment means nothing, for we are all well aware of the fact that at the end of this fiscal year there will be no money on hand, and the same would be true if the present administration were in power for the next 25 years to come. [Laughter.] My Democratic friends over here admit privately, and, of course, confidentially, that on March 4 next there will be a change of administration, and under an economical administration we shall undoubtedly have a balance every year.

Therefore, gentlemen of the House, I considered it important that this amendment be adopted, because, as I have just stated, in the event one of the Committees on Appropriations refuses to appropriate the money, under the next administration of the country we shall have funds on hand at the end of the year to go on and help build good roads. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this committee has no authority to make an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "more," in next to the last line of the amendment, and inserting "less."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I attempted to explain the object of my amendment a while ago. It is this: As the amendment is now written, it puts a limitation upon the appropriation, whereas by striking out "more than \$25,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "less," we leave unshackled the succeeding Congresses to do as they please. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it unleashes those patriotic gentlemen who would like to see, at some future time, a greater amount of money appropriated for this beneficent piece of legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be entirely unnecessary, yet there are so many Members of the House who are not yet fully familiar with the practice of the House that I am going to say a word about this portion of the bill. The practice in the House is that committees which do not have the right to bring in appropriations, as a rule, instead of appropriating money for a specific purpose, bring in a bill for the authorization of an appropriation, so that appropriations may be segregated in certain bills, so that Members may find upon an examination of appropriation bills whether an appropriation bill has been made for a specific purpose, and not be required to search through the entire volume of the statutes to see whether an appropriation is carried in some local or special bill.

Under the provisions of this bill, if enacted into law, and under the rules of the House, an appropriation of \$25,000,000 can be reported from the Committee on Appropriations in the sundry civil bill, if that shall be the bill that carries this item, as would naturally be the case; and if the committee does not bring in the item in the sundry civil bill and it is not carried in any other bill, any Member in the House is entitled to offer an amendment on the floor, when the bill is under consideration, to make the appropriation of \$25,000,000. That amendment would not be in order unless we had previously authorized it by law, because the rules forbid an amendment for an object which is not authorized by law, with certain exceptions, and this would not be one of the exceptions. So that, after all, the orderly way of making the appropriation for this or any other purpose is first to authorize it by law, and then it goes without saying that, as a rule, where Congress has spoken by special law and made an authorization, the Committee on Appropriations brings in the appropriation in accordance with the authorization of law. Only the other day we appropriated \$2,000,000 for the Alaska railroad. When the bill for the Alaska railroad was brought in it carried an appropriation. The House struck that out and made the authorization, leaving it to the Committee on Appropriations, nearly every member of which was opposed to the Alaska railroad, to bring in the appropriation when necessary; and they brought in an item of \$2,000,000 on the urgent deficiency bill the other day because they knew very well that, as far as their duty was concerned, it was to obey the will of Congress as spoken by the Alaska railroad bill.

Now, I do not think that we ought to make the appropriation unlimited. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] has offered an amendment which takes off the lid entirely. If his amendment should prevail, Congress, in a spasm of hysterics, might appropriate \$250,000,000 or \$2,500,000,000, and it would be in order in the House, or an amendment to that would be in order in the House. After all, while we are wise and, in the main, cool and conservative, the House and every legislative

house, guards itself and its own Members by rules against acting too hastily, on the spur of the moment, without consideration.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. If the authorization was limited to \$25,000,000 a year, and in the next sundry civil appropriation bill an appropriation bill was brought in for \$27,500,000, would it not be subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. It would be subject to the point of order, but any Member or the chairman of the committee could then offer an amendment for \$25,000,000 a year as provided by law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I understand my colleague [Mr. MANN]. Do I understand my colleague to say that we may not anywhere legislate and provide a permanent appropriation, and that an amendment so providing would not be in order?

Mr. MANN. I will say to my colleague that I did not speak on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I quite agree with my friend from the standpoint of orderly legislation.

Mr. MANN. I was not discussing the amendment which was ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I move to strike out the last word. In the last Congress I voted against this bill and I will vote against it now. I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] enlightened the House very well upon the purpose behind the bill and the future of these appropriations. I look upon this as the entrance of the camel's nose under the tent and the proposed legislation as the glorification of pork.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. With pleasure.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman is not condemning me for my frankness, is he?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. No; it would be hard to condemn the gentleman from Georgia; I know him too well. But I wish to say that the purpose of this legislation is apparent in the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, who puts up, unconsciously perhaps, the warning signal. We are appropriating to-day \$25,000,000, but he said that in the succeeding Congress, somebody, recognizing the beneficent work that this Congress has done, will be asking for \$50,000,000. Later on another gentleman, recognizing the beneficent work of that succeeding Congress, will be asking for \$75,000,000, and so it will go on until it amounts to \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000.

I am very glad that the statement has been made, in order that Members of this House may know what they are doing when they vote upon this bill. I believe that the purpose of it is wrong. Good roads are local matters, and Federal care is improper and unwise. I believe this Government of ours has problems enough upon its hands. For one, I wish at least to defer this appropriation for roads, because a greater problem confronts this Nation, something for the consideration of the people, not only along the seaboard but throughout the length and breadth of the Nation. I believe in deferring to the admonitions of those who are charged in an executive way with the concerns of this Nation. I take stock in their warnings and give heed to them, and I believe it is the duty of this Congress in a paramount way to give consideration to the question of national defense. [Applause.] I do not believe in appropriating this money when we have not got it. I believe, first and foremost, in making provisions for that thing which concerns us as a Nation in maintaining our national life. This Nation was worth fighting to establish. It is worth fighting, if necessary, to maintain. [Applause.] I am one of those who do not take a great deal of stock in the magic of men jumping up in a minute by the million to defend their country without any previous preparation, and so I hope this Congress will at least defer this legislation until we have given consideration to those weightier and far more important questions that confront us to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 1, strike out the word "agriculture" and the succeeding words to and including "marketing farm products," and insert "the manufacture and sale of automobiles."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply to put the bill on an honest basis. I represent two of the greatest agricultural counties in the State of New York.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes after debate, and it is too late.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say that I have never had a letter from a farmer in favor of this bill, but I have had a letter from an automobile manufacturer in my district and several from automobile clubs. There are 60 organized granges in my district, and they are frequently passing resolutions and sending them to me, but have sent none in favor of this bill. They know what the bill is; they know that it is a bill written by the automobile manufacturers. It will not do the farmers any good. This talk about its being for the benefit of the farmers is all bunk, and most of the oratory about the down-trodden farmer is hypocritical bunk. In speaking about the bill passed last year I said that there have been more foolish things advocated for the benefit of the farmer than crimes committed in the name of liberty. I suppose that nothing can stop the passage of this bill. It is one of those bills that everybody in private conversation says ought not to be passed, but there are only a few of us who dare to vote against it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman believe that the bill we passed last year is better than this bill?

Mr. PLATT. I think from the standpoint of the farmer it was, but I was against that, too.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did the gentleman vote for the bill in the last Congress?

Mr. PLATT. I did not.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I should not take the time of the House at this moment to reply to the jocular remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], for I realize they were made in part facetiously, as he admits, were it not that in his attack on Boston his long-range verbal artillery somewhat peppered me as well as my State, saying that I opposed the bill from the national-defense standpoint because of the powder company in my State. I commend to him the geography he used to study in school when he makes the statement that because there are certain factories making powder within the boundaries of my State I dared to get up here to-day and give my reasons why I should vote against his bill. I realize that he was in part facetious, but if his remarks should be taken seriously by any person or by any who read them, I want to say a little on the other side. The gentleman from Missouri has said so much about a certain "war-bride" stock, the factories of which are not contained in any one section, for they are scattered all over this Union, that I have probably as much right to accuse him of having bucked the market and lost as he has to impute unfair motives to me. [Laughter and applause.] I should probably have just as much right to say that the other day when there was a debate on the embargo question, and the great Missouri mule was brought up, that he was perfectly willing to have an embargo on everything except the animal that hauled the engines of war. [Laughter.]

I do not impute any sinister motives to him, but I think I would have as much right to impugn his motives on the question of embargo as he has to stand up here and attack a stock on Wall Street and then lay me over to the charge that I voted against his bill for the reason that I wanted to favor that business.

I gave my reasons for voting against the bill in a speech earlier to-day. I said your President came here upon the opening day of Congress, and if there were two salient points in his message that impressed one, regardless of how they felt on the preparedness question and revenue, it was the fact that the question of national defense and the question of revenue was to the fore. And yet we see this committee bringing in here to-day a bill which will take \$25,000,000 out of the Public Treasury before even the questions brought forth in the message of the President are considered. As I said this morning, you, or a majority on your side, are struggling to-day to meet the revenue situation. I do not mean to stand up here and point out as a new Member—for I am a new Member and I accept the gentleman's accusation—and try to tell the leaders on both sides what to do, but I can not vote for this bill, benefiting my State as it does in the way of some money being given it by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware asks that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I object. I will withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if any gentleman objects, I make the point of order that he must stand in his place.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. BLACK. I had already withdrawn the objection.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. As I said this morning, Mr. Chairman, my State has as much area in agriculture as any of the congressional districts in the Eastern States. I realize that under this bill it will get \$103,000, but the people of the State will have to raise \$103,000 more. I realize it is far easier for me to vote yea on this bill than it is to vote nay, but I believe that when you have conscientiously considered the bill and the debates upon it and have reached the conclusion that you should vote against it, that that should be enough, and that Members should not come in here and try to impugn your motives, whether they do so in a joking vein or seriously. I reiterate that this bill will be of some benefit to my State, but I am willing to go to the people there next fall with my reasons for voting against it. I do not think we should enter into an expenditure of this amount, and it will call for a larger amount in future Congresses. In other words, although this will benefit my State, I believe in considering the measure from the viewpoint of a national legislator rather than from the fact that it will help any district. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, of the amendment, after the word "year" insert "Provided, however, That no such aid shall be given except as a part of a comprehensive plan for a complete system of highways connecting the several States, which plan shall be prepared and published by a board composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General within six months after the passage of this act."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to a point of order. This is a limitation purely upon the language of the bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It seeks to create a board.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Missouri to make the point of order?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I make the point of order, although I can reserve it. The point of order I was about to make was that the amendment proposes to create a board, which is not germane to that section of the bill, but I shall withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has been offered by the committee, and of which we all have printed copies, seeks to uphold the constitutionality of this bill by referring to three great departments of the National Government, and by specifying that the roads proposed to be constructed under its provisions may be used for the transportation of interstate commerce, so that it will come under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution; the transportation of military supplies, so that it will come under the constitutional power to raise and support armies; or for the transportation of postal matter, so that it will come under the power of Congress to establish post offices and post roads.

Mr. Chairman, this bill with this amendment proposed by the committee purports to be a national bill. One of the reasons why I have always been a Republican is because the Republican Party has stood ever since its birth in favor of having the National Government do things that are national in scope and character. This bill, however, as it comes to us from the committee, even with this misleading amendment, has nothing national in it. There is no more justification or excuse for this

bill than there would be for a bill appropriating money out of the National Treasury to construct schoolhouses in the different States of the Union, or for a bill to construct police stations in the different States of the Union, or for a bill to construct sewers in the different cities and towns of the United States. If, however, the amendment which I have offered—and offered in good faith—is adopted, the bill will be national in character.

I have taken the committee at its word, and in my amendment I have provided that before any aid can be given out of the National Treasury under this act there must be a comprehensive plan, established, prepared, and published by a board representing these three great departments of the Government which are named in the committee amendment, namely, the Secretary of War as representing the moving of military supplies and forces, the Secretary of Commerce as representing the transportation of interstate commerce, and the Postmaster General as representing the interest of the National Government in post offices and post roads. With such an amendment providing for the preliminary preparation and publication of such a comprehensive plan of which every mile of road built under the provisions of this bill must be an integral part, we men who believe in a National Government for national purposes can support a bill of this kind, but in its present form, never.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman support this bill if we adopt his amendment?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were—ayes 63, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the amendment be amended by striking out the figures "25," in line 11, and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "40."

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in good faith. The amount of the appropriation, after all, will rest with the Committee on Appropriations each year. That committee can report no appropriation at all, or if it wishes, it can report any amount up to the amount fixed as a limit by this bill. My idea is that we ought to fix a limit higher than \$25,000,000. I anticipate that there will come a time when the Treasury of this country will be in better shape than it is now, when the annual revenues of the Government will be sufficient to meet its necessary expenditures and leave a fair surplus in the Treasury, and the Appropriation Committee ought to have a wider latitude than this bill gives. I do not believe that the amount should be unlimited, as was proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD], but I do think we ought to raise the limit that can be appropriated to at least \$40,000,000 in any one year. Now, while I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly express my views upon this bill. I think the committee amendment, as amended, should be accepted. I think it improves the bill from a legal point of view. I have had some misgivings as to the constitutionality of this measure. This amendment of the committee broadens the scope of the bill and goes a long way toward removing what I consider a constitutional objection to it as originally drawn. The power of the Federal Government to enter upon a policy of improving the public roads in the several States is not very clear in my mind, but it must be limited to those purposes enumerated in the Constitution. I think the Government clearly has the right to establish post roads and such other roads as may be used for interstate commerce. The other purposes mentioned in the bill are incidental to these purposes, and will not, I hope, prove to be a vital objection to the bill. I am in favor of this bill as it is amended, or proposed to be amended, because I believe we ought to go just as far as we can within constitutional limitations in improving the public roads of the country.

I am in favor of it because the people of the district which I have the honor to represent are deeply interested in the improvement of public highways. I am in favor of it, because it will encourage the people of the different States to help themselves in the improvement of their roads. The burden of building good roads is a heavy one—too heavy to be borne entirely by the people of the immediate vicinity of the roads. Where the roads are so constructed as to be beneficial to the country at large, as postal or interstate roads, I believe the Federal Govern-

ment should aid in their construction. In Illinois we have a law under which the different counties can secure State aid to the extent of half the cost of the road, under certain conditions. We think this is a good law, for it has greatly encouraged the construction of hard roads. I believe this bill, if it passes, will likewise encourage the building of good roads all over the country, especially those roads that are used for post roads and for through travel or commerce between the States. And this leads me to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I am in favor of this bill for another reason which has not been emphasized as much as I think it should have been by those who have spoken in favor of the bill. It will prove a great blessing to the rural mail carriers of the country. I had occasion recently to address a communication to all the rural mail carriers in my district—174 of them, I think—and I asked them this question: "Have you any suggestion as to the proposed legislation that would help the service?" The answer that came back from nearly every one of these rural carriers was, "Give us better roads."

And, Mr. Chairman, I think if there is a class of Government employees who, more than all others, deserve the consideration of this Congress, it is the men who deliver the mail over the country routes. [Applause.] They are the men who have to go out in all kinds of weather and deliver the mail to the homes of the people. The expense of maintaining their equipment, as I am informed by the carriers of my district, is from \$300 to \$600 per year, and a large part of this is due to the bad roads these men have to travel during at least a part of the year. And if we can adopt any legislation within constitutional limitations that will remove some of the burdens from the rural mail carriers of the country and make their lives and their labors better for them, I think we should do it. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Does not the gentleman think the Post Office Department could make their lives a little pleasanter if they tried?

Mr. DENISON. That may be true, that the Post Office Department might do so; but I do not believe the Post Office Department will do it, so I think Congress ought to do so. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, the rural carriers in my district deserve better conditions than they now have to labor under; they—

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I understand the gentleman from Illinois is favorable to this bill whether his amendment is adopted or not.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir; I am going to vote for it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And the gentleman in good faith believes the amount ought to be increased to \$40,000,000?

Mr. DENISON. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that I believe the Appropriations Committee ought to be authorized to go that far. We are entering upon a new policy in passing this legislation. And while I do not believe it would be wise for the committee to recommend an appropriation of the full amount while the National Treasury is in the present impoverished condition, still, as I have already said, I hope and believe the time will soon come when we will return to our former method of raising revenue for the Government, and we will have a surplus in the Treasury to use for this purpose; and if we are going to start now and enter upon this new policy of aiding in improvement of the public roads, we ought to put the limit of the amount that can be appropriated high enough to do some good; the Appropriations Committee can then appropriate more for this worthy purpose when we do get into a better financial condition. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of Illinois, I am sure, would welcome Federal aid in the construction of the great Lincoln Highway, which is planned to cross this country from one coast to another. The agitation for this great highway has already encouraged the plans for other through highways which will prove to be a great benefit and blessing for the country. I have the honor to represent that old district in southern Illinois that was once represented in this House by Gen. John A. Logan. There are few, if any, names more sacred to the people of my district than that of Gen. Logan. There has already been planned and laid out another great interstate highway known as the Logan-Lee Highway, which begins somewhere away down in the heart of the country where the name of Lee is held so sacred, and runs north through the State where Logan lived, until it intercepts the Lincoln Highway. The people of my district and State, as well as of many others, are deeply interested in this great interstate road, which, while it may have in the beginning been somewhat inspired by sentiment, will just as surely result in a great material benefit to the people of the

States through which it will pass. I am in favor of this bill, because I believe that the Federal Government should encourage and aid in the construction of such interstate highways, and I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted and that the bill as amended will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to amend the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana and Mr. SHACKLEFORD demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I called for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 99.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the section strike out the period and insert the words: "And no appropriation shall be made during the year 1916."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have long been an advocate of Federal aid for good roads. I advocated it long before I came to Congress, when the question of Federal power in this direction was not so generally admitted as it is now. I believe the pending bill is the best bill that has been before the Congress upon this subject [applause], but, Mr. Chairman, where is the money coming from to pay this \$25,000,000 this year? I have listened to the debates which have gone on, and I have heard no suggestion from any source as to where the revenue is coming from to meet this expenditure now. Our Treasury to-day, Mr. Chairman, is practically empty. The deficit is growing from day to day and from month to month. In view of that situation, what is the duty of the Members of Congress in this regard? Is it to vote to launch into new fields of expenditure involving \$25,000,000? Would a prudent business man conduct his own business in that way?

If any Member of Congress in his business life was met with the condition that we are confronted with in our Federal Treasury, would he begin a new expenditure, although it might be a wise policy under normal conditions? Would he do it, not knowing where the money was coming from to meet this new expenditure? Now, Mr. Chairman, the majority, it is true, is responsible not only for the appropriations that are made, but for the revenues to meet them; but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House has the responsibility upon his shoulders as to voting for appropriations. We on this side have no right to vote for every appropriation that comes before us and against every tax that comes before us and then afterwards go out upon the stump and charge the majority with not being able to conduct this Government in a competent way. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House, it seems to me, in this crisis in our financial affairs, so far as the condition of the Treasury is concerned, ought to vote against every new field of expenditure that is not necessary. That means not only a vote for the amendment I have proposed, that simply provides no appropriation shall be made during the year 1916, but it means that he will not vote for any public-building bill involving new expenditures that are not necessary or a river-and-harbor bill, involving new projects that are not necessary, but will confine himself in voting for only necessary appropriations. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the committee that the deficit that now exists in our financial affairs—

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Grows out of the ordinary expenditures of government.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What is the deficit to-day?

Mr. LENROOT. I have not looked it up to-day.

Mr. GORDON. The surplus was \$40,000,000 day before yesterday.

Mr. LENROOT. When I say the deficit, I mean the deficit that has grown up between the surplus that existed at the time the Democrats went into power and the surplus that exists to-day.

Mr. GORDON. What the gentleman means is there is no deficit, but an actual surplus of \$40,000,000; but it is less than it was formerly? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. What I mean is, if there had not been a large surplus when the Democrats came into power there would

be an actual deficit in the Treasury to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the situation. What do you propose to do about it? As I said, these are ordinary expenditures. No one in this House believes for a moment, no matter what we think about preparedness, that the appropriations for naval and military purposes will be less than they were last year; and so with every other department of the Government. How, then, can you justify an expenditure, however wise it may be under normal conditions, that is not necessary now?

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a plain, common-sense business proposition, and the Members of this House ought to be brave enough and courageous enough to face it as a business proposition. My district, Mr. Chairman, would benefit probably as much as any by the money that would be received from this appropriation this year, but I am satisfied that my constituents desire me to treat these great questions in a business way; and I am satisfied to leave the matter with them, so far as my individual vote is concerned upon the amendment I have proposed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is some force in the argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. He is very thoughtful and does not usually speak without saying something material, but this time I think he is unduly alarmed.

This is not an appropriation bill. It is a bill to authorize appropriations which shall be made by the proper appropriation committee and that has to go to the Senate and be there considered. If it should become a law at this session of Congress, it will be time enough for the watchful gentleman from Wisconsin to raise his objections against a bill reported by the proper appropriation committee. The appropriation committees are honest and faithful. Surely the Appropriation Committee would take into account the exigencies of the Treasury. We are asking here only for an authorization. If it shall pass both Houses and receive the signature of the President it will then be soon enough to consider whether we will make an appropriation this year or not, and, if so, the amount of such appropriation.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We have fought it along for four or five years. Do not put this log across our pathway now. But if it becomes a law I will join the gentleman, or any other thoughtful gentleman, in safeguarding the Treasury. If an appropriation should be made under the authority we are seeking here to give, if one should be reported, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] can call on me to stand by him to see that no improper appropriation is made, taking into account the condition of the Treasury. But I ask him to impute to the Appropriation Committee just as much honesty and patriotism in that regard as he and I have ourselves. They will not make an appropriation if it is not warranted.

Mr. LENROOT. I do impute that same honesty; but the gentleman is aware, as I am aware, that the Appropriation Committee very properly, when we authorize an expenditure, deems it its duty to make the expenditure authorized by law.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, this does not provide that \$25,000,000 shall be expended, but that the appropriation shall not in any year exceed \$25,000,000, and if the money is not in the Treasury an appropriation committee would not be called upon to make an appropriation of that sum or of any other sum.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman if this becomes a law will he ask the Appropriation Committee to make an appropriation this year?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Well, I do not know until I see what the amount of money is and how much we can expend and all conditions that surround it. If I think it is proper, I certainly would ask the Appropriation Committee to do it, but I would be governed by the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman agree not to ask for any money this year?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Agree with whom?

Mr. TILSON. Well—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The House is not authorized to enter into any agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HAYES. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

With the kindest of feelings toward the able chairman of the Roads Committee, I direct his attention to the fact that he misquoted on this floor my statement made on Saturday last. I wish also to say that with the very high regard I have for the distinguished John Dalzell, who so ably and for so long represented his district in this House, I would dislike to think if he were present now he would cast his vote for this measure.

I wish also to inform the gentleman that I am a friend and not an enemy to the American farmer, and already in this House I have cast several ballots in the interest of that distinguished citizen of the Western States. But I rise now not to discuss this question of good roads nor to defend the State of Massachusetts, for, as a great statesman once said on this floor, she needs no defense. But I do rise to defend the principle that is involved—a great principle that had its development, if not its birth, in the great State of Massachusetts—and that is the principle of local self-government.

And this principle which has done so much for our whole country, while it carries with it privileges and advantages, also entails duties and responsibilities; and from the earliest history of the town government of New England, the caring for its highways has been a prominent feature.

The Puritans were to some extent trained in the principle of Democracy through the struggle with King James and the church. By reason of this struggle they discovered and adopted the principle of congregational independence. Each church was in itself a little republic, and from this practice probably came the principle of town government so peculiar to New England.

And here on the broad acres of this North American continent a splendid opportunity was afforded for the trial and development of this great experiment for the benefit of humanity.

So in Massachusetts this principle is firmly established. They have come honestly by it, and they have learned to love it for the things it has done. Had it not been for the privileges it afforded the individual the ranks of the emigrants in pioneer days would not have been so readily filled, and more, the quickness with which New England rose to strike for independence, giving courage and hope to the other colonies, was largely due to the splendid independence and individualism developed in the town governments of Massachusetts, and which government in somewhat modified form has been transplanted to other States in the form of township government.

I suggest to those who have so severely criticized Massachusetts not to be too caustic in their denunciation. Remember the sturdy, independent character of the New Englander, with his strong individuality, is traceable to the principle for which they now so stoutly contend and which principle contributed much to the splendid fight against an unjust principle of taxation in colonial days.

New England has a right to be proud of her numerous little republics, dotted as they are all over her various Commonwealths and in no State more developed than in Massachusetts, with the possible exception of Rhode Island, where the spirit of local independence is evident in the two capitals of that State.

And while we are in these days tending strongly toward centralization, so strongly, my friends, that if Hamilton himself could stop in and see us now he would be proud of his handiwork.

But let us, gentlemen, instead of heaping strictures on the Massachusetts Members for their stand, just recall what local self-government has done for our whole country and remembering the loyalty with which this principle was maintained by the immortal Jefferson as an antidote to the dangers of centralization, had we better not be careful of our action before ruthlessly brushing aside a principle so dear not only to New England but the people of this entire Nation? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, does that exclude a substitute for the section?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] that we agree upon the time for closing debate.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I desire five minutes in which to discuss the amendment.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request is withdrawn. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON:

"Page 2, line 4, after the words 'fiscal year,' insert the words 'and no appropriation exceeding \$5,000,000 shall be made for the year 1916.'"

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the roads bill as it now stands authorizes an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the current year and for each subsequent year. My amendment, which has just been read, proposes to limit the appropriation for the current year to \$5,000,000, so that the \$25,000,000 appropriation will begin in 1917.

We are making an experiment with this roads bill. Why should we make such a colossal experiment? The law must be tried before we can know whether it is workable and will be satisfactory. There is no need to make the trial on such a large scale.

This bill has been criticized severely. It is said that it violates Democratic principles; that it places too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture; that its intended benefits are too much bound up in red tape; that the control of its benefits will be in the hands of State highway boards and engineers who will distribute them not according to merit but as a matter of political favor. It is further charged that the bill is really an automobilists' bill and not a farmers' bill, and that it will result in the construction of trunk lines of road for the chief benefit of tourists and automobilists, and that the dirt roads and the bad roads back in the rural districts will not be able to get any of the money. These are serious criticisms and should not be dismissed lightly. They have been fortified on the floor of the House with logical arguments, and evidently there is basis for them. It must be admitted that we can not know how the law will work nor whether it will be satisfactory until it has been tried.

The \$5,000,000 appropriated for 1916 will give an opportunity for the trial of the law. It will be ample for organization and experiment. The people will have notice of what they may expect and will be given an opportunity to avail themselves in future of the beneficent provisions of the bill.

It is an admitted fact that our National Treasury is not in good condition. Attention has been called in a very forcible way to the fact that our revenues are not sufficient to meet our expenses. That is a question that this Congress will have to wrestle with. Except for the fact that the European war found a surplus in the Treasury there would have been a deficit. This is indeed a serious situation.

The situation calls for the practice of rigid economy. The Democratic revenue law of 1913 was a success prior to the outbreak of the war. It was drafted to meet conditions as they were at that time. Since the outbreak of the war there has been a great falling off in revenues. This is due to the decrease in importations from which tariff duties would have been collected, and also a decrease in revenues from spirits, beer, and tobacco, caused by prohibition laws and by the hard times which decreased the consumption of such things.

Appropriations made by the present Congress must be provided for by the revenue bill which will be presented later. Normal conditions will not return to this country until the close of the European war. Our importations of foreign goods are yet far below normal. Those countries are unable to manufacture, prices are greatly increased, and it seems likely that it will be several years before our importations will reach their normal level. Until that time there should be the exercise of the strictest economy in national expenditures.

We can not spend money without first placing it in the Treasury. The only way that this can be done is by taxation, direct or indirect. Every appropriation which Congress makes means an added tax laid upon the people. The \$25,000,000 appropriation for an experiment in national aid to roads represents heavier taxes which in all probability will be laid upon the necessities

of life. It means that the workingman must pay more for his clothing, food, and other necessities of life. It must come out of the people and we should be careful how we spend this money. I am not willing to experiment on such a colossal scale when the cost must be borne by the masses. This experiment will perhaps mean the retention of the sugar duty, which means a tax of 1 cent per pound on every pound of sugar consumed in this country, an increase in the price of 1 cent per pound.

No necessity can be shown for the large appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the first year. All large appropriations should be closely watched until that period when we may expect normal revenues from tariffs and from internal taxes. For these reasons I think the amendment which is in the interest of economy should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to the committee amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment as previously amended.

The committee amendment as previously amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the whole bill, which I ask the Clerk to read. It is to strike out the enacting clause and insert the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKELLAR offers the following substitute for the whole bill: "Strike out all of the bill except the enacting clause and insert the following"—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not in order. The House has just inserted, by way of amendment, section 1. It is too late to move to strike out a thing after the House has inserted it by a vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, then I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to when will be the proper time to offer the bill of last year as a substitute for the pending bill?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the gentleman asking unanimous consent for leave to offer it now, as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that the proper time to offer a substitute will be after the bill has been read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is my notion about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the bill which we passed last year, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk to be read at this time, and I ask unanimous consent to offer it now as a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. MANN. If we can avoid reading it, I shall not object.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have no objection to the gentleman offering it, if it will not take too much time.

Mr. MANN. Let us dispose of it now.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asks unanimous consent to offer a substitute for the whole bill at this time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Now, can we have a limit on the debate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing. I want very little time myself.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Five minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. If there is any gentleman on my side who wants to talk, I should like to see him have an opportunity. I do not want more than 5 minutes myself.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes, of which 5 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that the substitute be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Everybody knows about that bill, which is the one we passed last year, and I ask unanimous consent that it be offered without reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the gentleman will not ask that, because I should like to have the bill read.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to have it read, it is not very long.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not very long, and I think the Members of the House ought to hear it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be read, and that there be 10 minutes' debate, of which 5 shall be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

McKELLAR] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that there be 10 minutes' debate, to be divided between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the proposed substitute, as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, may aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in an amount not exceeding \$25,000,000 in any fiscal year; that out of said amount which may be so expended in any fiscal year shall be paid the expenses incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act, and that to administer the provisions of this act he is authorized to employ such engineering and other assistance and incur such expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere as may be necessary; that after deducting from said \$25,000,000 a sum sufficient to pay the expenses of administering this act by the Secretary of Agriculture the portion of the remainder which may be expended in any State in any fiscal year under the provisions of this act shall be determined upon the following basis, to wit: Sixty-five thousand dollars in each State and the balance in the respective States, one-half in the ratio which their total population bears to the total population of all of the States, as shown by the next preceding Federal census, and one-half in the ratio which their total mileage of rural post roads bears to the total mileage of rural post roads in all of the States, as shown by the report of the Postmaster General at the close of second quarter of the last preceding fiscal year; that on or before the 20th day of January in each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount which under the provisions of this act may be expended in each State during the next fiscal year and the proportions thereof which may be expended under section 3 and section 4 of this act and transmit by registered mail a copy of such statement to the governor of each State on or before the 31st day of said January: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1914, the Secretary of Agriculture shall so prepare and file said statement and transmit copies thereof to the governors of the respective States within 60 days after the final passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the term rural post roads, as used in this section, shall be held to mean any public road outside of incorporated cities over which the United States regularly carries rural mails either by free rural delivery or star-route carriers.

Sec. 2. That on or before the 1st day of January in each fiscal year each State highway commission, or in the event there is no such highway commission then the governor of each State in conformity to the laws of such State, or in the absence of any law of such State on the subject, may elect whether Federal aid to the construction and maintenance of rural post roads in such State shall be given under the provisions of section 3 or section 4 of this act, or partly under both sections and the proportion under each, by filing a written statement of such election in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1916, such election shall be made within 45 days after the final passage of this act. If the said State highway commission, or where there is no such commission the governor of any State, shall refuse or fail to make such election as provided by this section, then within 10 days after the time in which said governor is authorized to make such election has elapsed the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine said matter.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the officers of the several States having lawful authority in that behalf in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads. That between the 1st day of February and the 30th day of June in each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture and the officer, or officers, of each State having lawful power to act for the State may jointly consider and determine the roads in such State which, under the provisions of this section, may be constructed and maintained during the next fiscal year and the material, character, and manner of such construction and maintenance; that the several States shall afford such inspection and supervision of said construction and maintenance as shall be required by the Secretary of Agriculture; that in no case shall the United States bear more than one-half of the cost of the construction and maintenance of any road under the provisions of this section; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not commence such joint construction of any road in any State until the portion of the cost thereof which is to be provided otherwise than by the United States has been made available.

Sec. 4. That certain roads in the States which are adapted to use by the United States as rural post roads shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class C.

Class A shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of macadam or other material of equal utility and cost, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class B shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track composed of shells, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay or other material of equal utility but less expensive than macadam, constructed and maintained in such manner that it shall have a smooth, firm surface.

Class C shall embrace roads upon which no incline is steeper than is reasonably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with adequate drainage and ample side ditches, with a roadway constructed so as to quickly shed water into the side ditches and kept crowned and compacted by dragging or other adequate means so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles.

That on or before the 1st day of March in each fiscal year the governor of any State may file in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture a statement setting forth the location and the number of miles of roads in such State which he claims to be in each of classes A, B, and C, respectively; and if such State have a State highway department then his said statement may be accompanied by a report from such State highway department showing the total number of miles of roads in such State in each of classes A, B, and C, the location of such roads, a description in detail of their physical features, the material, manner, and, as far as may be, the cost of their construction and the manner and cost of their maintenance.

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider such statements and determine which of the roads mentioned therein are in class A, which in class B, and which in class C, and make a report of his said

determinations to the respective governors, filing such statements, on or before the 20th day of the following June.

That no charge shall be made for so considering and determining such statement of any governor if the same shall be accompanied by a report from the State highway department of such State as hereinbefore provided; but in all other cases there shall be deducted 10 per cent of the amount which shall be payable on account of the roads in such State under the provisions of this act.

That at the end of each fiscal year the United States shall pay on account of the roads so determined to be in classes A, B, and C, as follows: On each mile in class A the sum of \$60, on each mile in class B the sum of \$30, and on each mile in class C the sum of \$15: *Provided*, That if in any State the aggregate of said sums would exceed the amount which for that fiscal year has been apportioned to such State under this act to be expended under the provisions of this section, then said sums per mile shall be reduced pro rata so that their aggregate shall not exceed said amount.

That nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States under the provisions of this section for any road which does not clearly come within the requirements of class A, B, or C as hereinbefore defined.

That such payments shall be made to such officers in the respective States as the governors thereof shall indicate as being lawfully entitled to receive the same by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed as authorizing any governor to create any new office.

That such payments of money made by the United States as hereinbefore provided shall, during the ensuing fiscal year, be applied to the construction, maintenance, or extension of the respective roads for which paid and that in addition thereto the State or civil subdivisions thereof shall, during said ensuing fiscal year, expend in the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads an amount equal to the amount so paid by the United States; that if such sums are not so expended upon the construction, maintenance, or extension of said roads, respectively, during the ensuing fiscal year, then at the end of such fiscal year nothing whatever shall be paid by the United States on account of any road upon which there has been a default in such expenditure: that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine whether such expenditures have been so made, and to aid him in such determinations that the proper officers of the State shall make such showing as he shall require.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to make all needful rules for the proper administration of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 6. That necessary bridges and culverts shall be deemed to be a part of the respective roads constructed, improved, or maintained under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after July 1, 1916.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill that has just been read as a substitute for the pending bill is precisely the same bill, word for word and letter for letter, except that 1916 is substituted for 1914, as the bill that was passed last year by a vote of about 7 to 1. It is almost precisely the same as the bill that was passed two years ago in a preceding Congress by quite a large majority. The difference between the two measures is this: This substitute has all of the provisions about State highway commissions and the designation of certain roads to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture that the present bill has. In addition it has a provision that all the roads of the country shall be divided into three classes—class A, class B, and class C. The State can elect to have the funds expended for upkeep on all of the roads in the State or district or it can leave the matter to the State highway commissions just as reported by the committee. What is the difference in practical language? It is simply this, that one of these bills, the substitute bill I offer and the one you passed last year, is really and truly a bill for the benefit of the farmers of the country, for the country people through which the roads pass. The present bill is a bill for the automobile associations, to a very large extent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but I wish the gentleman would be brief, for I have only five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The substitute offered is the bill that was passed last year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Word for word and letter for letter except that 1916 is substituted for 1914.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman lives in a farming community and has just gone through a very interesting campaign.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary; I represent Memphis, Tenn., one of the largest cities in the South.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me ask the gentleman, Was this an issue in his campaign?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And did the farmers in his section want this kind of a bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. They did; the farmers want this kind of a bill, if I am any judge. I want to tell you why. Under the present bill it depends upon the local State highway commission whether any particular district gets a dollar of this money. That commission has a right under this bill to select the particular roads they can spend the money on. They can spend the money on one road or in one or three counties in the State. Your district may be left out entirely under the terms of this bill. If you pass this bill, there may be some trouble at home. Now, this substitute provides that all the people shall receive

the benefits of this act, and the money is to be distributed in a more equitable way, or distributed in a way that we believe will be a great incentive to road building, not in a special locality but in all parts of each State.

It is a question for you to determine whether you are going back on what you did four years ago or two years ago and adopt a different system. The present bill is for the benefit of certain roads, largely automobile roads, and the substitute is for the benefit of the whole people. I want to say frankly that if the substitute is voted down, I am going to vote for the bill reported out of the committee. Why? I am for road building just as I am for education. I will vote for any kind of a road bill just as I will vote for any kind of an educational bill, because I believe that the best way to aid the people is to build up the educational facilities of our country and to build up the roads of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one can do but little in the brief space of five minutes toward affording a full and sufficient answer to the contentions of a speech like that of the gentleman from Tennessee which is related to, and concerned with a bill not before the House, and one moreover with respect to which a large portion of this body is not informed. In the exceedingly limited time at my disposal I will give the best answer that I can to objections, to the pending measure urged by the gentleman from Tennessee. These objections, I maintain are not well taken.

As a Member of this House, I have been a friend of Federal aid to roads for a longer time than my friend from Tennessee and actively concerned during that period in the preparation of the bills that have embodied this principle. I do not think that anyone who is acquainted with my record would accuse me of reporting, or otherwise indorsing a bill that favors the automobile interests as against those of the farmers. The fact about this bill, or rather the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee is that it appears to have entered into a party fight in the State of Tennessee, as a sort of campaign issue. But this fact does not furnish a sufficient ground for replacing the committee bill, with the pending substitute. We have tried to point out the reasons that impelled the committee to report the pending bill in its present form. The bill of last year was a good one, but the bill of this year is better, and one that in the light of our last year's experience we consider more likely of passage. The situation therefore that confronts the committee is whether we will reject the substitute and pass a bill that we have reason to believe will be successful in the other body, or accept the substitute of our friend, in order to meet the local exigencies in Tennessee, and thereby imperil the entire measure, at the other end of the Capitol. The bill of last session contained two sections in the alternative, one relating to the construction of roads by the Federal Government and the States, in cooperation—

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have but five minutes and can not yield—and the other classifying the roads, with a view to the payment of certain fixed sums by the Federal Government, in the way of maintenance. The classification clause was opposed by the Department of Agriculture, and was the subject of bitter attack upon this floor. Further it was strenuously assailed in the Senate of the United States. Having all of this in mind, and desiring to pass at some early date in the House a bill that would stand a reasonable chance of enactment by this Congress, we eliminated section 4 of the bill of last year, the classification section, and amplified section 3, so as to make it the pending bill. This section provides as efficiently for the farmers as it is possible for any bill to do, that embodies the principle of Federal aid, and at the same time is concerned with being fair to all the interests and all the sections, of all the country. I am opposed to imperiling a good bill, merely to meet a local situation in one State, as developed by the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the reply of the gentleman from Tennessee. Most emphatically, this is not an automobile bill. Take this measure just as it has been reported, and it will be noted that the selection of the roads to be built, or maintained, is left to the road departments of the several States. Hence the quota of each State will be applied in conformity with the policy of that State. For instance, the quota of the State of Massachusetts from which we have heard so copiously this evening, will be administered by the local authorities of that State.

If Massachusetts favors automobile roads, I am free to say that it will be possible under the operation of this bill for Massachusetts to apply every dollar of her quota toward the construction of automobile roads, unless checked in this direction by the veto of the Agricultural Department. On the other hand if the policy of that State favors the application of her

quota in aid of a general system of roads for the benefit of all the people of that State, farmers included, I undertake to say that this bill will fit in with that policy.

I desire to say one thing further in this connection, and that is that all of the objections urged to this measure by the Representatives from the great cities of the Union have been founded upon an absolute misapprehension of the scope and purpose of the bill. This bill is not a sectional measure. It was not conceived in antagonism to the cities, or designed to hinder their development. Further while it may be applied in one State upon any one type of roads preferred by that State, it was not designed with a view to favoring any special type of road construction. It was designed for the exclusive benefit of neither the cities, the automobile concerns, nor I may say, the farmers. On the other hand it is a bill that by reason of its flexible capacity of adaptation to the local policies of the several States concerned in road improvement will concurrently benefit the cities, the farmers, and if, you please, the automobile concerns, and the automobile owners, since you can not construct even a purely farmer's road without an incidental benefit to the concerns that build, and the citizens who operate that wonder-worker of the day, the modern automobile.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617 and had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1916.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives a list of contests for seats in the House of Representatives for the Sixty-fourth Congress of the United States, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House, and also transmit herewith all original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, as follows:

- State of Massachusetts, eleventh district.
- State of Wisconsin, fourth district.
- State of South Carolina, first district.
- State of Connecticut, fourth district.
- State of Illinois, at large.
- State of Pennsylvania, twentieth district (withdrawn by request of contestant).
- State of New York, twentieth district.

The Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in all of the above cases. In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act relating to contested election cases," such portions of the testimony in the above cases as the parties in interest agreed upon, or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest and the answers thereto, and such portions of the testimony as were not printed with the original papers have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in each case have been mailed the contestant and the same number to the contestee. The law in reference to the briefs of both the contestant and contestee in each case has been complied with as far as possible upon receipt by the Clerk of said briefs.

So far as the briefs have been furnished to the Clerk, they are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections upon the order of the House, together with a tabulated statement, which has been prepared by the Clerk, showing the number of pages of testimony and the present status of each contested-election case, and all the papers in connection therewith.

Massachusetts, eleventh district, Francis J. Horgan v. George Holden Tinkham.

Wisconsin, fourth district, W. R. Gaylord v. William J. Cary.

South Carolina, first district, Aaron P. Prioleau v. Richard S. Whaley.

Connecticut, fourth district, Jeremiah Donovan v. Ebenezer J. Hill.

Illinois, at large, J. McCan Davis v. William Elza Williams.

Pennsylvania, twentieth district, A. R. Brodbeck v. C. William Beales, contest withdrawn by request of contestant.

New York, twentieth district, Jacob A. Cantor v. Isaac Siegel.

Yours, respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE, Clerk of the House.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3518. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

REFERENCE OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following reference of contested-election cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Committee on Elections No. 1: The contests in the fourth district of Connecticut, the first district of South Carolina, and the State of Illinois at large.

To Committee on Elections No. 2: The contests in the eleventh district of Massachusetts and the twentieth district of Pennsylvania.

To the Committee on Elections No. 3: The contests in the twentieth district of New York and the fourth district of Wisconsin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRUKKER, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. FOCHT, on account of death in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the American merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to extend his remarks in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement of Senator VARDAMAN on the subject of the national defense.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it appears to me it would be out of order for the House to extend a request to insert certain remarks of a United States Senator when, with all due respect to that great body, they use most of the space in the RECORD already for stating their views. Unless there would be some special reason why this should be done, I certainly would be impelled to object.

Mr. MANN. I was going to ask where was this speech made?

Mr. BAILEY. This was a statement given out to the press.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8712) granting an increase of pension to Mary Y. Tarbox; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9905) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to expend \$150,000 to restore to proper condition the frigate *Constitution*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 9906) to establish a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9907) to establish postal savings banks, to enable the Government to borrow money directly from the people, and to market its bonds directly to the people in small and varying denominations through the medium of the post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9908) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9909) to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9910) to establish a preparatory military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9911) to amend sections 2, 13, and 14 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen," etc., approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9912) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9913) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9914) making appropriations for a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9915) to provide for an examination and survey of the harbor at Cape Vincent, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9916) to regulate the rural mail service in the State of Indiana and fixing compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 9917) to amend the act of August 30, 1890; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9918) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9919) for the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9920) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Minidoka and Cassia, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9921) to grant the right of appeal to employees in the Federal classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 9922) to amend section 90 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, so as to place the county of Walthall in the Jackson division of the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 9923) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Mitchell and the county of Baker, both of the State of Georgia, acting jointly or separately, and their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Flint River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9924) for the regulation of salaries in the custodian service of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 9925) for the erection of a public building at Modesto, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9926) to exclude Hindu laborers from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VENABLE: A bill (H. R. 9927) providing for an examination and survey of Pearl River, Miss., between Jackson and Edinburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 9928) to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to common carriers of interstate and foreign commerce and within the District of Columbia, and combinations in restraint of trade; to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. THOMPSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9929) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate and determine the amounts equitably due by the Mississippi Choctaws for services and expenses incurred in their behalf in the matter of identification and removal to the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 9930) to amend the act of February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., p. 807), providing for the opening of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: Resolution (H. Res. 102) to print 2,000 additional copies of the soil survey of Bryan County, Okla., for use in the House document room; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 103) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to send to the House of Representatives certain information with regard to Rear Admiral Fletcher's order of February 13, 1915, and also with regard to day individual (battle) target practice of fleet for 1914 and 1915; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) proposing an amendment to part 16 of section 8 of Article I and section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) providing for a change of policy in the manner of handling the reservoir waters at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9931) granting an increase of pension to Ann Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 9932) for the relief of George W. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9933) granting a pension to William Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9934) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Earl W. Shaffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9935) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9936) granting an increase of pension to Alice Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to Ralph E. Truman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9938) granting a pension to Bridget Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 9939) granting a pension to Bessie Yarbrough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Radcliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9941) granting an increase of pension to Mark V. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9942) granting an increase of pension to David McCrory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9943) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES: A bill (H. R. 9944) granting an increase of pension to Seymour H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9945) to amend the military record of John Gallagher, alias John Cunningham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 9946) waiving the age limit for admission to the Medical Corps of the United States Navy in the case of John B. Bostick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9947) granting a pension to Jay A. Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) for the relief of the Kern County Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Bakersfield, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of the M. A. Sweeney Shipyards & Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 9950) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Hallenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9951) for the relief of William Redder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9952) granting an increase of pension to A. L. Burket; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9953) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9954) granting a pension to Fannie Boswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 9955) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9956) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. De Coursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9957) granting an increase of pension to William A. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9958) granting a pension to David W. R. Manson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9959) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallocate the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 9960) for the relief of the Portland Co., of Portland, Me.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9961) granting an increase of pension to Jennie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9962) for the relief of Truman R. Peters and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9963) granting a pension to David A. Kooker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9964) granting a pension to Abraham H. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9965) granting an increase of pension to Irene L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9966) granting a pension to William A. Shively; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9967) granting a pension to Edmond L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 9968) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. H. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 9969) for the relief of Joñas Archquette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9970) granting an increase of pension to Amanda S. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9971) for the relief of Harold Holst; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9972) granting a pension to George Iran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 9973) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) for the relief of Joseph Stoich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCracken: A bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Cecil G. Thorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9976) granting a pension to Charles A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCulloch: A bill (H. R. 9977) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9978) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) granting an increase of pension to Newton Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9980) granting an increase of pension to John Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9981) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Edmonds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9982) granting a pension to Barbara Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKinley: A bill (H. R. 9983) granting a pension to James A. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9984) granting an increase of pension to James V. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9985) granting an increase of pension to James Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9986) granting a pension to Homer Meloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9987) granting a pension to Elsie E. Gathright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9988) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hawkes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9989) to correct the military record of William Alexander and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9990) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9991) granting an increase of pension to Richard Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9992) granting a pension to Ida M. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9993) granting an increase of pension to Nora McEnhill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9994) for the relief of Samuel H. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9995) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to execute and deliver a deed in favor of and to Ida Seymour Tulloch, Roberta Worms, and Ethel White Kimpell for subplot 38 of original lot 17 in reservation D, upon the official plan of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Mary C. Herrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9997) for the relief of Charles P. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 9998) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9999) granting an increase of pension to John M. Langsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10000) granting an increase of pension to John Toner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10001) granting a pension to J. Frank Cornman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10002) granting a pension to William E. Noakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 10003) for the relief of the estate of the late Jesse R. Stubbs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10004) for the relief of the estate of the late Thomas C. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10005) granting an increase of pension to Robert Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10006) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10007) for the relief of William H. Woods; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 10008) granting an increase of pension to S. Maria Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10009) granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10010) granting a pension to A. J. Wacaster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10011) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, urging consideration of the Nawiliwili Breakwater project; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of the Greek-American League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8255, for relief of Benjamin Ammons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Burton, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of Commercial Club of Nashville, Tenn., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in the banks of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Gloversville, N. Y., silk mills, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of business men of Appleton City, Windsor, Leeton, Archie, Knobnoster, Pleasant Hill, Montserrat, Centerville, Holden, Chilhowee, Blairstown, Warrensburg, Strasburg, Kingsville, Urich, Calloway, Montrose, Rockville, Creighton, Garden City, East Lynne, Harrisonville, Belton, Raymore, and Peculiar, cities and towns in the sixth congressional district of Missouri, in support of what is known

as the Hinebaugh bill, proposing the enactment of legislation which will compel concerns selling goods directly to the consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, county, and State into which said goods are shipped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7074, for the relief of Emma S. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8545, for the relief of Rebecca Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 6579, for the relief of Amy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Gardner, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grand Lodge of the German Order of Harn-gair, of Illinois, favoring an embargo on shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Boston Post Office Clerks' Association, Branch No. 5, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring House bills 7654 and 7655, to retire postal employees and to prohibit the discharge of the employees of the Postal Service for certain disabilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Stork Bros., hosiery manufacturers, of Adams-town, Pa., favoring protection for manufacturers of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of library committees in session at Chicago, Ill., asking that libraries be exempted from the provisions of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Griffin Button Co., of Shelton, Conn.; New England Cotton Yarn Co., of New Bedford, Mass.; Phoenix Underwear Co., of Little Falls, N. Y.; Knoxville (Tenn.) Spinning Co.; Elk Cotton Mills, of Dalton, Ga.; H. R. Epler & Sons, of Reading, Pa.; Anniston (Ala.) Yarn Mills; and E. C. Beeten & Sons, of Carlisle, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 8423, for the relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9848, granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9474, granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers in support of claim for special pension for Jennie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Irene L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring appropriation for Government work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOUD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of M. G. Esch, John H. Gerth, Joseph Hecking, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Petitions of James Devlin and Henry J. Heitman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Gilbert S. Graves and 44 citizens of Oswego, N. Y., favoring national censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. N. Darling and 31 citizens of Cazenovia, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of J. Broadbent & Son, of Connecticut, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Lees Button Co., of Leominster; Shiverffs Worsted Co. and Star Worsted Co., of Fitchburg; and Aetna Mills, of Watertown, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Middleton, N. Y., protesting against tax on tooth paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Baldwin Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elmira, N. Y., advocating preparedness, the protection of our citizens, and the honor of our flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petitions of Kalamazoo Amusement Co. and Koch & Buchter Orpheum Theater Co., of Kalamazoo; and Wonderland Theater, of Vicksburg, Mich., protesting against Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of A. J. Brosseau, of Albion, Mich., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of C. Moore Co., of Westerly, R. I., favoring the passage of the bill to encourage and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of F. E. Spencer, of Guilford, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Watts, of New Haven, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 8435—1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petitions of theaters of the United States, relative to equitable distribution of any tax the present Congress may levy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that every path of human activity leads to Thy throne. We have never been able to get away from the consciousness of human responsibility. Thou hast taught us to look forward to the judgment of our own lives without fear. Thou hast taught us that our lives will be in review before Thee. The ideals that we seek to work into the plan of human life and government are derived from Thee, and that which we write into law must stand the test of the divine law. Grant us Thy grace to see the larger meaning of life and law in the light of Thy life and of Thy law. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 255).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to \$47,525.33 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under provisions the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, submitted by the Attorney General, and which require an appropriation for their payment, etc., amounting to \$5,006.89 (S. Doc. No. 253), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$27,695.12, which have been presented to the department and require an appropriation for their payment (S. Doc. No. 252), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a communication from the General Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, transmitting a tabulation of a referendum vote on the question of making a marked increase in the development of the foreign commercial service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce and the Consular Service in the Department of State, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.